8193. aaa. 5.
1-3.

# Mr. *HOADLY*'s FOUNDATION OF THE Present Government DEFENDED.

BRITISH MUSEUM

# THE FOUNDATION OF THE Present Government DEFENDED,

In Two PARTS.

I. Some CONSIDERATIONS Humbly Offer'd to the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of *EXETER*; Occaſion'd by his Lordſhip's Sermon Preach'd before Her Majeſty, *March* the 8th, 1708.

II. An HUMBLE REPLY to the Right Reverend *The Lord Biſhop of* EXETER's *Anſwer.*

AND

A *Poſtſcript*, Relating to the *Beſt Anſwer ever was made*, &c.

By *BENJAMIN HOADLY*, Rector of St. *Peter's Poor.*

*LONDON:*

Printed, for E. SANGER at the *Poſt-houſe* at the *Middle-Temple-Gate*, and J. PEMBERTON at the *Golden-Buck* overagainſt St. *Dunſtan's Church*, both in *Fleetſtreet*, 1710. Price 1 *s.*

BRITISH MUSEUM

# *Some Conſiderations humbly offered to the Lord Biſhop of* Exeter, *&c.*

*My* LORD,

IT is with extreme Reluctance that I force my ſelf to give your *Lordſhip* this preſent Trouble. But the *Love of Truth*, which ought to be above all humane Conſiderations, will, I hope, plead my Excuſe with your *Lordſhip*, and with all Perſons of impartial and honeſt Minds, for the great Preſumption of this *Addreſs*. The *Cauſe* it ſelf, which determined me to it, is a *Cauſe* in which I have for ſome time been engaged, and which I think my ſelf under ſome ſort of Obligation ſtill to proſecute; eſteeming it of the utmoſt Importance both to the Honour of *Chriſtianity*, and the Security of *Humane Society*: For the Sake of both which it deſerves ſeriouſly, and impartially, and frequently, to be conſidered, whether the *Nature* and End of *Government* neceſſarily take away from the *governed Part* of *Mankind* the *Right* of *Self-Defenſe*; or whether the *Goſpel* of *Jeſus Chriſt* hath utterly deprived them of any ſuch Right, and left them naked and defenſeleſs againſt all poſſible Attempts of their *Governours*. Your *Lordſhip* hath been pleaſed to expreſs ſome Zeal for the affirmative Side of theſe *Queſtions*: And I am ſenſible, that your *Lordſhip's Reputation* and *Authority* are ſo great, that of themſelves they are thought, by many, ſufficient to fix the Stamp of *Truth* upon what bears a Name ſo much honoured and reſpected. But your *Lordſhip* knows full well, that where a Veneration for Perſons prevails more than the *Love* of *Truth*, as *Truth*; there even *Truth* it ſelf becomes vile, and loſes its Beauty and Grace before Men, as well as forfeits its Title to the Rewards of *God*. I humbly therefore hope, that your *Lordſhip* will not

take it amiſs, if I freely examine thoſe Thoughts and Obſervations upon this *Subject*, which your *Lordſhip* hath lately publiſhed to the World. If I may be permitted to do this, it cannot poſſibly do the leaſt Injury either to *Truth*, or the *Goſpel* we profeſs, when it is ſeen that I do it with all the *Reverence* due to your *Lordſhip's* high Station and Character; and with all the Regard due to that *Integrity* and *Goodneſs*, which ſhine ſo bright in your *Lordſhip's* Example.

*My Lord*,

The *Sermon* preached by your *Lordſhip* before Her *Majeſty* on the *Eighth* of *March*, 1704, is the Occaſion of this Trouble: Which compared with *that* preached at St. *Dunſtan's* in the *Weſt*, on *March* 8. 1704, gives us ſuch an Account of your *Lordſhip's* Judgment concerning the *Duty* of *Subjects*, and the *Original* and *Authority* of *Governours*, as ſeems to me to give juſt Ground for ſuch an Examination of it as I at this Time deſign.

1. In the *Sermon* preached 1704, *p.* 9, your *Lordſhip* acknowledges, that the *Scripture leaves every Country to it ſelf to eſtabliſh that Form of Government, which is moſt ſuitable to its own particular Temper and Genius.* Again, *p.* 15. *There is no one particular Form of Government that can truly be ſaid to be of divine Inſtitution, and Appointment.* Again, *p.* 18, 19. *The Deſignation and Appointment of particular Perſons to the Adminiſtration of the Government, this is humane; and the Diſtribution of the Power of Government into one, or into more Hands, this is likewiſe humane: This is the Ordinance of Man only.* Again, *p.* 23, 24, it is declared that *No Man hath a natural Right to the Government of a Kingdom: That the only Right thereto muſt be a legal Right, ſuch a Right as is given him by the Law and Conſtitution of the Realm*; i. e. by the ſovereign Legiſlative Authority for the Time being. And that the *Kingly Power* is not lodged in our *King* or *Queen* ſolely, but in *King*, *Lords*, and *Commons*, conjointly, is freely declared by your *Lordſhip*.

2. I obſerve, that in giving an *Account* of the *divine* In-

*Inſtitution* of *Government*, *Sermon*, 1708, p. 4, 5. your *Lordſhip* declares, that *that* ought to be taken for the moſt *rightful Government*, which is eſtabliſhed; and *that* for the *beſt Title*, *which hath prevailed by Preſcription*, *or is ſettled by the Conſtitution*: That you do not affirm, or think it implied in any Expreſſion of St. *Paul*, or any other *Scripture Writer*, that the *Form* of *Government*, or *Perſon Governing*, are deſigned, and marked out by God, *any otherwiſe than as all Revolutions are brought about by the Working or Permiſſion of God*: And that when you affirm *Government* to be of *divine Inſtitution*, you underſtand by this, that *it is the Will of God that ſome ſhould bear Rule, and that others ſhould be in Subjection*; *and that they which bear Rule, ſhould enact Laws for the Preſervation of Juſtice and Peace amongſt their Subjects, and duly execute the Laws made for that Purpoſe: In which two things the whole Power and Exerciſe of Sovereignty do conſiſt.* This is all the *divine Right* your *Lordſhip* acknowledges.

3. Your *Lordſhip* adds, p. 6. That the *Authority* by which the *Magiſtrate* acts, in all *Forms of Government*, *is a Ray or Portion of the divine Authority and Power, derived to him from, and communicated to him by, God.* But then your *Lordſhip* contends, *p.* 16. that this *Commiſſion* from *God* to the Civil Magiſtrate, is not *abſolute, and unlimited*; *and that he can act with Authority no farther, nor otherwiſe, than as he is warranted to do by his Commiſſion.*

After I have thus preſumed to lay before your *Lordſhip* your own Words upon theſe ſeveral Heads, in order to make farther Uſe of them; I beg leave to mention ſome *Particulars*, which ſeem inconſiſtent with theſe *Principles*, or in which I am forced to differ from your *Lordſhip*; tho' Matters of great Importance both to the *Religion* we profeſs, and to the Foundation of the *preſent Eſtabliſhment* under which we account our ſelves ſo happy: And I beg leave, with all Submiſſion, to examine them with that Freedom and Impartiality which becomes a Lover of Truth. And,

I. From the *Magiſtrate*'s being called the *Miniſter of God* by St. *Paul*, your *Lordſhip* argues, that he hath none above him upon Earth, to *queſtion, cenſure, or puniſh him*; and that he is accountable to none but God.

1. In Anſwer to this, I might here put your *Lordſhip* in Mind, that St. *Paul* hath guarded his own Expreſſion very cautiouſly and judiciouſly; that he tells *Subjects*, not barely that the *Magiſtrate* is the *Miniſter of God*, but that he is *the Miniſter of God to them for Good*; which manifeſtly ſhews that he is ſpeaking in general, with reſpect to the Nature and Deſign of the Office; which is the Ordinance of *God*, as your *Lordſhip* before explained it, in this Senſe, becauſe it is agreeable to his Will, that ſo good and uſeful an Office ſhould be kept up in humane Society. But all this reaſoning falls to the Ground, when once it is ſuppoſed that the *Magiſtrate* is not the *Miniſter* of *God*; as it is impoſſible he ſhould be, in any thing diſagreeable to his Will. I mean in the Senſe now contended for. Granting therefore, that in his *Office* he is the *Miniſter of God*; yet in contradicting the only Deſign of his *Office* he cannot be ſo: nor can the Argument hold good. This hath been argued at large in a *late Treatiſe*, concerning the *Meaſures of Submiſſion:* Nor hath the leaſt Reply been given to it, beſides general and poſitive Affirmations to the contrary.

2. I might likewiſe put your *Lordſhip* in Mind, that every Perſon in the World, who is the Inſtrument of Good to us, is the *Miniſter of God to us for Good*. And this may be affirmed of them without any ſuch univerſal and unlimited Inference as this: Which is ſufficient to prove, that the *Magiſtrate*'s being called the *Miſter of God*, or in the *Apoſtle*'s Words, *the Miniſter of God to us for Good*, cannot juſtifie any ſuch Inference.

3. I will beg leave to ſhew your *Lordſhip*, that the *Magiſtrate*'s receiving a *Commiſſion* for one particular Work, immediately from *God*, ought not to be an Argument, in your *Lordſhip*'s own Judgment, to prove that there is none upon Earth that may *queſtion, cenſure*, or *puniſh* him. Your *Lordſhip* contends, *p.* 16. That

his

his *Commiſſion* is not *abſolute* and *unlimited*, but confined to one Purpoſe, *viz.* that of *Civil Government*. Your *Lordſhip* contends, that, for another Purpoſe, the *Eccleſiaſtical Officers* have received likewiſe a *Commiſſion* from *God*; and are the *Miniſters* of *God* as properly, for the *Ends* of their *Office*, as the *Magiſtrate* is for the *Ends* of *his*. Yet, tho' they be the *Miniſters* of *God*, and his Servants only; it doth not follow, according to your *Lordſhip*, that there is *none upon Earth to queſtion, cenſure, or puniſh them*. From whence I argue, That the being the *Miniſter* of *God*, in the moſt proper Senſe, is not, of it ſelf, an Argument to prove ſuch an Exemption as is here mentioned: For if it were, then would the *Eccleſiaſtical Officers* be exempt from that Reſtraint, and Cenſure of the *Civil Magiſtrate*, under which your *Lordſhip* hath concluded them in all things, but thoſe which their *Commiſſion* empowers them to do. I would not willingly be miſtaken; and therefore I add, that what I am now ſaying is this, That the being called the *Miniſter* of *God*, or the being actually commiſſioned by *God* for one particular Work, doth not, of it ſelf, prove the Perſon ſo commiſſioned abſolutely exempt from all *Queſtion* and *Cenſure*. And this I was led to ſay, by your *Lordſhip*'s Argument drawn from hence. The Truth of the Matter ſeems plainly this; That, as the *Commiſſion* of the *Miniſters* of the *Goſpel* cannot exempt them, in *Caſes* in which they are void of all *Authority*, and to which their *Commiſſion* reacheth not; ſo cannot it be proved barely from their *Commiſſion*, that *Magiſtrates* are in a more exempt Condition. For a *Commiſſion* gives an *Authority*, and conſequently a *Superiority*, only in thoſe Points to which it extends it ſelf; leaving all others as it found them. Your *Lordſhip* well obſerves, that they can act *with Authority* no farther than their *Commiſſion* reaches. Conſequently therefore, they can have a *Superiority* no farther than their *Commiſſion* reacheth. And it follows infallibly from hence, that their *Superiority* vaniſheth in thoſe Inſtances in which they act *without*, or *againſt* their *Commiſſion*. One of

theſe two Points muſt be proved, either that the *Commiſſion* given by God to *Magiſtrates*, gives them a poſitive *Authority* to act againſt the *Ends* of their *Inſtitution*, and the Deſign of their *Commiſſion*; or that they remain *Supreme*, even in thoſe Caſes in which they have no *Authority*; and in which they cannot be the *Miniſters of God*,; tho' it be their *Authority* only, and their being the *Miniſters of God*, that gives them this Supremacy. *Nor ſhould this, methinks, ſeem ſo ſtrange to your Lordſhip*, ſince the *Caſe* of a *Mayor* in a *Corporation*, *who, after his Election, is not accountable to thoſe that chuſe him, but to the Queen, by whoſe Commiſſion he acts*, (by which *Inſtance* your *Lordſhip* very unfortunately endeavours to illuſtrate your Poſition) may be found to help us very much in diſcovering the Truth of this Matter. For the *Commiſſion* given to this *Mayor*, makes him not *ſuperior* to any in the *Corporation*, unleſs it be in the due Execution of the *Office* he is called to. Nor will the *ſupreme Governour* cenſure or puniſh any *Freeman* for oppoſing this *Mayor*, in any Caſes but thoſe to which his *Commiſſion* reacheth, Nor doth the *King* or *Queen* by this *Commiſſion* exempt him from an Equality in other Inſtances. And in all *Caſes* where the Danger is imminent, Violence is allowed to be repelled with Violence, and the ſame Behaviour which is allowed in the *Caſe* of *Equals*. Nor doth his being, in other Caſes, the *King's Miniſter*, exempt him. The Application is ſo plain, I need not make it; and your *Lordſhip* affirms that the *Caſes* are parallel. If ſo, then the being the *Miniſter* of *God*, and commiſſioned by him, gives the *Supreme Magiſtrate* a *Superiority* over the *governed Society* no farther than is conſiſtent with the Safety and Happineſs of the *Society*, for which alone he was commiſſioned.

4. Doth your *Lordſhip* think that St. *Paul* could not intend his Exhortations to have reſpect to *deputed Magiſtrates*, as well as the *Supreme*; and that he could not poſſibly underſtand by the *higher Powers*, and his general way of Speaking, *all* in ſo uſeful an *Office* as that of *Magiſtracy*? If he could, as he certainly did; then

then *deputed Magiſtrates*, as well as the *Supreme*, are called by him the *Miniſters* of *God*: and this alone will deſtroy your *Lordſhip*'s Argument drawn from that Title. Nay, Are not *deputed Magiſtrates* the *Miniſters* of *God*, and may they not juſtly be called ſo, who help to execute ſo uſeful an Office? And yet we ſee, this cannot prove ſuch an *Exemption* as your *Lordſhip* ſpeaks of: therefore, neither will this alone prove it for others. And with reſpect to the *Caſe* of *deputed Magiſtrates*, It is obſervable, (what hath been often quoted by the *Patrons* of *Paſſive Obedience*) that our *Lord* told *Pilate*, that his *Power was from above*. But he being a *deputed Governour*, was undoubtedly accountable to Man: Which ſhews that a *Magiſtrate*'s being called the *Miniſter*, or *Servant* of *God*, doth not imply in it what is by ſome deduced from it. But, after all,

5. I muſt intreat your *Lordſhip* not to think that I am contending for the Words *Accountable*, or *Cenſure*, or *Puniſhment*. I know none who are ſolicitous about them. All that is contended for with any Zeal, is this, that there ſhould be a *Right* left in the *governed Society* to preſerve it ſelf from Ruine and Deſtruction: Which is a Point that your *Lordſhip* hath not touched upon. The *Commiſſion* of *Fathers* is from *God*; and their very *Perſons* are pointed out by him: Yet was it never doubted, as I know of, that, ſhould a *Father* be ſo outragious, or mad, as to attempt the Lives of his *Children*, his Hands may be tied, and Self-Defenſe be juſtly practiſed by them. Nor do I know that ever any one, merely for ſaying this, was reviled, or thought to diſſolve all *Filial Obedience*. His being the *Miniſter* of *God* therefore, let it make him never ſo unaccountable to his *Children*; yet doth it not, in the *Caſe* of *Habitual* or *Actual Madneſs*, take from them the *Right* of *Self-Defenſe*. So likewiſe, let the *Magiſtrate* be, in never ſo proper a Senſe, the *Miniſter* of *God*; and never ſo *unaccountable*, never ſo much *ſuperior* to his Subjects; yet doth not this in the leaſt deveſt the *governed* from the *Right* of *Self-Defenſe*, and *Self-preſervation*: As we ſee in all other parallel Inſtances

ſtances whatſoever, that *Superiority* in *one* doth not rob *others* of the *Right* of *Self-defenſe*. And with ſubmiſſion, my *Lord*, if the *Caſe* had been put after this manner, every one at firſt view muſt have ſeen the little force of the Argument now before us. And what I have been ſaying holds true, whatever the *Original* of *Government* were, and whenceſoever *Governours* have their *Authority*. But becauſe your *Lordſhip* hath thought fit to enter into *that*, I beg leave to follow.

II. In giving an Account of the *Authority* by which *Magiſtrates* act, your *Lordſhip* is not content that an *humane Inſtitution* ſhould have an *humane Authority*, but contends that the *Power* of the *Magiſtrate* muſt be immediately from God.

1. Your *Lordſhip*'s firſt Reaſon is, becauſe he can have this *Power* no other way, *p. 9. for no Man hath it originally and eſſentially in himſelf*, (which ſome Men will think a very great, and too large a Conceſſion;) *and that he can't have it from the People, is evident; becauſe it is ſuch a Power as the People never had, nor could have, and what they have not themſelves, they can't give to another.* The *Power* which your *Lordſhip* inſtanceth in, is, *the Power to cut off evil Doers*, i. e. *Enemies* to the *Society*: And this your *Lordſhip* affirms that the People never could have. *No Man hath Power either over his own Life, or over his Brother's.*

On the contrary, I do affirm, and hope to prove, 1. That, for the Sake of *public Good*, a Man is allowed to have ſuch Power over his own Life, as to contract that, when *that* requireth it, it ſhall be given up; which is all that is pretended in the *Caſe* of *Civil Government*. This is plain from hence, that when a *Soldier* voluntarily liſts himſelf into the *Service* of his Country, he contracts in effect to this Purpoſe, that when his *General* commands him for the Publick Service, and it becomes neceſſary for his Country's Good, he muſt and will venture where he is ſure to loſe his Life. So likewiſe in *Civil Govern-*

*ment*

*ment*, a Man may have the ſame Power over his own Life, voluntarily to contract, that when the *publick Good* requires it, and the *Magiſtrate* ordains it, he will ſubmit. But your *Lordſhip's* Argument, drawn from a Man's not having Power or Authority to lay violent Hands upon himſelf gives the *Queſtion* a wrong turn, and is apparently of no weight; ſince it will as well prove that a Man may not voluntarily enter into the Military Service. There is, I hope, a great Difference between a Man's violently ſending himſelf out of the World, at the time, and after the manner, which the *public Good* doth not require; and his contracting to give up his Life to the Conſideration of *public Safety*: And a Man may have Power to do the *one*, tho' not to do the *other*. And becauſe this may be thought not fully to touch the Point, I add, what will come nearer to the *Caſe* in hand, that, ſuppoſing no fixed *Magiſtrate*, or *General*, a Nieghbourhood of Perſons, in danger from *Robbers* and *Murtherers*, attempting their Ruine, may jointly conſent to go out againſt theſe Enemies: and any particular Man hath ſuch a Power over his own Life, that He may with Honour, voluntarily run upon inevitable Death, knowing that He doth ſo, in order to ſuſtain the firſt onſet of theſe *Enemies*, and for the Safety and Security of his *Neighbours*. And as He hath this *Power* in himſelf; ſo, ſuppoſing a *General* choſen by *him* and *others*, he doth by this Choiſe transfer this Right to the *General*, and oblige himſelf to do the ſame at his Command, which he *might* himſelf voluntarily do before. But,

2. It is of ſmall Importance to this *Queſtion*, whether a Man have any ſuch Power over his own Life, or no; if ſo be that he appears to have it, in ſome particular *Caſes*, over the Life of others. Now, 1. The *Queſtion* being here, what Power Men have, before there is ſuppoſed a fixt *Governour* of a Society, your *Lordſhip* ſeems to forget this, when you ſay that a *private Man* would be a *Murtherer* ſhould He, of his own Head, kill even a *Maleſactor*.

For

For tho' this may poſſibly be true, in ſome *Caſes*, ſuppoſing a *Government* fixed; yet ſuppoſing no fixed *civil Government*, this is ſo far from being true, that *he* would be a *public Benefactor*, who ſhould kill a *public Enemy*. As *Cain* thought it but juſt to fear, that all would be armed againſt a *Murtherer*, as an *Enemy* to the whole Race of Mankind, and had a Right to defend themſelves from ſuch an one. So likewiſe ſuppoſing a *Band* of *Deſtroyers* coming down upon a Place not yet ſettled under *Civil Government*; have not the Inhabitants ſuch a Power over the Lives of theſe *Robbers*, as to enter into a *voluntary Aſſociation*, and take Arms to defend themſelves by deſtroying them? And may not they transfer this *Right* of *Self-Preſervation*, by empowering one, or more Perſons, to ordain, and do, what ſhould be neceſſary on all ſuch Occaſions: and ſo give to them a *Power* over the *Lives* of *others*, as truly as any *civil Magiſtrate* upon Earth hath it? And if in a State, in which no *eſtabliſhed civil Government* is ſuppoſed to be ſettled, (and ſome ſuch there actually yet are in the Wildneſſes of the *Earth*;) *Private* Men have certainly this *Right*, which is no more than that of *Self-defenſe* and *Self-preſervation*; then they may certainly transfer and convey the Exerciſe of this *Right*, in all ordinary *Caſes*, to *one* or more Perſons, for the greater Security of *Public Happineſs*. And that they have not this Right, upon ſuppoſition of no *civil Government* ſettled, your *Lordſhip* hath not attempted to prove. But this is not all, for, 2. When a *civil Government* is actually ſettled, there are extraordinary *Caſes* in which *Private* Men may juſtly kill *Malefactors*, *of their own Head*, as your *Lordſhip* expreſſeth it; and conſequently, have ſuch a Power over their *Brother*'s Life, as your *Lordſhip* is pleaſed to deny them. As in Caſe of a ſudden and violent Attaque upon their Lives, and the Lives of their *Family*, in which an Appeal cannot ſoon enough be made to the *Magiſtrate*, they have a *natural Right* to kill the *Attempters*, reſulting from that *Right* to *Sef-preſervation* given them by *God*.

And

And these things are so plain, that I cannot help expressing some Astonishment to find a Person of your *Lordship*'s Judgment, and great Abilities, overlooking all this, and urging only a few Affirmations to the contrary. All this shews that Men have such a Right to Self-defense, (which implies in it often, by necessary consequence, a Power over the Lives of others;) as is sufficient to convey to *civil Magistrates*, agreeably to the Will of *God*, all that Power over the Lives of others which they can justly claim, or lawfully put in Execution. Nor can I help observing that our *Parliament* hath openly asserted the *original Contract* between *King* and *People*, as the Foundation of *civil Authority*; the same *Parliament*, my *Lord*, which laid the Foundation of that *Alteration* in the *Succession* to the *Crown*, which your *Lordship* defends in the *former* of the *Sermons* just now mentioned; and that *Parliament* to which we owe all the Happinesses we enjoy, or hope for.

2. Your *Lordship* is not content with this Argument only, to devest the *People* of all pretension of being the *Original* of *civil Authority*: But is pleased to add, that the Position is directly contrary to what the *Apostle* affirms, That *there is no Power but from God*. A way of Interpretation which will as well prove all *Usurpers*, all *Robbers* in Power, to have a *Commission* immediately from *God!* whereas your *Lordship* knows (and hath observed it in this very Sermon in the *Case* of *Nebuchadnezzar*) that the *Scripture* useth this Expression in many Cases where the *Providence*, the *permissive Providence*, of *God* only is concerned; and where there can be no *Commission* from Him possibly supposed. And here St. *Paul* speaking of *Magistrates*; it is most reasonable to interpret these Words, that there are none possess'd of *Authority* for the good of humane *Society*; (which is the *Magistrate's Authority*;) but that this *Authority* is *of God*, agreeable to, and founded upon, his Will. And all that your *Lordship* thinks fit to make of this, and the like Expressions, in the *former* part of your *Sermon* is, that it is agreeable

able to the Will of God, that ſome ſhould bear Rule, and ſome ſhould Obey, in *humane Society*. But who can believe that St *Paul* intended by ſuch an Expreſſion at once to condemn that Doctrine, that the *Power* of the *Magiſtrate* is originally derived to Him from the Contract or Conceſſion of the People? I am ſure when your *Lordſhip* can prove that the *Apoſtle* deſigned in theſe Words to contradict and condemn this Notion rightly underſtood; I may undertake to demonſtrate, that by thoſe other Words, *The Powers that be, are ordained of God*, the *Apoſtle* meant to aſſure us that the very *Forms* of *Government*, and the *Perſons governing*, were then, and are always, pointed out by the immediate Voice of *God*. And indeed, I ſhall not doubt, by the very ſame Arguments by which your *Lordſhip* will prove that St. *Paul* condemned the one, which you are pleaſed to condemn, to prove that St. *Paul* did likewiſe as poſitively condemn the *other*, which you are pleaſed to maintain. And if your *Lordſhip* think it abſurd to hold that the very *Perſons governing* are *ordained* by *God* immediately, notwithſtanding the high Expreſſion of the *Apoſtle*, I hope others may the more eaſily be forgiven, who uſe not greater Latitude in interpreting the *one* Form of Expreſſion, than your *Lordſhip* doth in the Interpretation of the *other*. And why your *Lordſhip* allows not the ſame Latitude in *both*, I cannot well imagine.

3. Another Argument I find added, *viz.* that the *Notion*, now condemned by your *Lordſhip*, is plainly grounded upon a Suppoſition falſe in Fact, *viz. that there was a great Number of Men living before the Inſtitution of Civil Government, which whole Multitude of Men had then, by natural Right, the ſame Power over ſingle Men, which is now exerciſed by the Magiſtrate*: Which your *Lordſhip* denies to be true, *becauſe every Man deſcending from Adam and Eve, in his natural Capacity, is born a Subject to his own Parents, and, in his political Capacity, to the Chief Governour of that State, of which, at his Birth, he becomes a Member*, p. 11. But,

1. Your

1. Your *Lordſhip* in the ſame Place grants that *this indeed might poſſibly have been true in Caſe this Multitude had been all created at one and the ſame Time*: Not remembring that you had before maintained, that the *Power* of the *Magiſtrate* could not originally be in the *People*, for reaſons inconſiſtent with this way of arguing. For what ſignifieth it in this *Caſe*, whether they come into Being all at once, or no; if the Power of Life and Death, which is in the *Magiſtrate*, be, as your *Lordſhip* hath before declared it, of that Nature, that no private Man, or Company of Men, can have any Thing of it in themſelves to communicate to any other? For if Men had all ſprung up together, they could have had no more Power over their own, or their *Neighbour's* Lives, than they have now they are born one of another. Or, if your *Lordſhip* will give me Leave to make Uſe of this Conceſſion, that the *Power* of the *Magiſtrate* might have been derived from the *People*, had Mankind been created all at once; then I muſt argue, that all that your *Lordſhip* hath ſaid before, concerning the Power of Life and Death, is of no Importance to the *Cauſe*.

2. Your *Lordſhip* is pleaſed to diſtinguiſh between the *Natural* and *Political Capacity* of a Man born into the World: From whence I argue, that a Man may poſſibly be born free in his *Political Capacity*, tho' not free from all the Subjection due to a *Father* and *Mother*, in his *natural Capacity*; and conſequently, if *Civil* and *Paternal Government* differ, as your *Lordſhip* ſeems to think, it will not prove, that there was not a Number of Men in the World before the Inſtitution of *Civil Government*, to allege that Men are *born* one of another: It will not prove that there always was a *Civil Government*, to allege, that there was always *Paternal Government*. The *Right* to *paternal Authority* is a *natural Right*: But your Lordſhip aſſures us often, that no one hath a *Natural Right* to *Civil Government*, and conſequently, ſay I, *Paternal* and *Civil Authority* are two ſo diſtinct Things, that tho'

Man

Man be not born free with reſpect to the one, yet he may, with reſpect to the *other*; and his being born, and conſequently born under *Subjection* to *paternal Authority*, which is a *natural Right*, ſignifieth nothing to prove that there might not be a great Number *born*, before the *Inſtitution* of *civil Government*, to which there is no *natural Right*.

3. Your *Lordſhip*'s Argument againſt this *Freedom* is this, Every Man, ſince the Firſt, is born a Subject to his own *Parents* in his *natural Capacity*; and, in his *political Capacity*, a Subject to the *civil Government* under which he is born. Now the Thing to be proved was, That there never was a Time without *civil Government*. The Subjection to *Parents*, I have ſhewn, in your *Lordſhip*'s own Judgment, to have nothing to do with the Freedom we are now ſpeaking of. And for what your *Lordſhip* adds, that *every Man ſince the firſt is born, in his political Capacity, a Subject to the chief Governour of the State, of which he is born a Member*; this is taking the Thing for granted which is the *Queſtion* in Diſpute. For the Point in Debate is, in effect, this very Thing, whether every Man, ſince the firſt, was born a *Subject*, in a *political Capacity*, to a *Civil Governour*: And your *Lordſhip* here proves it, barely by affirming it; which will not effectually convince thoſe who ſeek for Reaſons for what is affirmed.

4. If there be no ſuch Thing as a *Natural Right* to *civil Government*, as your *Lordſhip* ſaith, then there muſt be a *State* of *Equality* preceding the *Inſtitution* of it; and it muſt inevitably be founded upon a *voluntary Compact* and *Agreement*, without which no *one* Perſon could have any more real, authentic Right to it than *another*. For if there were not an *original State* of *natural Equality* with reſpect to *civil Government*; then certainly there muſt be, in ſome particular Perſon or Perſons, *a natural Right* to *civil Government*. But your *Lordſhip* aſſures us there is no ſuch Thing; therefore it follows, with a *mathematical Evidence*, that the *State* of *Nature*, with reſpect

to

to *civil Government*, is a *State* of *Equality*. And I cannot but wonder to find that your *Lordſhip* can urge ſuch ſort of Arguments as ſeem inconſiſtent with your own Conceſſions: Eſpecially conſidering that your *Lordſhip* hath not thought fit in the leaſt to conſider what hath been largely ſaid by ſeveral Writers in Anſwer to this *Argument*, or to hint the leaſt Conſideration which might furniſh a Reply to them. Nor can I wonder leſs, to find your *Lordſhip* declaring, *p.* 4. that *the Title of the firſt Kings that ever were in the World was moſt probably only their Paternal Right to rule and govern their own Children and Deſcendants.* For this *Paternal Right* is a *natural Right*, and therefore cannot be thought by your *Lordſhip* to be a Right to *civil Government* over their *Deſcendents*; becauſe you ſay, there is no ſuch Thing as a *natural Right* to that. That the *Fathers* of *Families* might be at firſt pitch'd upon by many *Clans* and *Societies* of Men, to be *Civil Governors* likewiſe, hath been thought probable by many wiſe *Writers*; or that their *civil Government* might have been ſubmitted to, tho' taken up by themſelves without any formal Choice: But then their *Right* to *this* could not be the *Paternal Right*; but was founded upon that *voluntary Choice*, or *Submiſſion*. Your *Lordſhip* therefore hath deveſted the firſt *Kings*, (who probably had the beſt *Titles* in the World) of all *Title* to their *civil Power*, by fixing it upon a *Paternal*, which is a *natural Right*; and at the ſame Time declaring, that there is no ſuch Thing as a *natural Right* to *Civil Power*, and making a Diſtinction (as there is indeed a moſt manifeſt one) between Mankind in a *natural Capacity*, and Mankind in a *political Capacity*.

5. There are at this Day, and have been in every Age, Inſtances of *People* in the unciviliz'd Parts of the World, without any eſtabliſhed *civil Government*: And if ever *Government* comes to be rightfully ſettled amongſt them, it muſt be by *voluntary Compact* and *Agreement*; and, we ſee, hath been preceded by a *State* of as great an *Equality*, with Reſpect to *civil Government*, as is contended for by any Writer that I know of.

8. But I cannot ſee what mighty Advantage your *Lordſhip* would procure to the Cauſe you defend, could you demonſtrate that the *Authority* of *Governours* comes from *God*, in the Senſe inconſiſtent with the Suppoſition of a *Contract* founded upon a *State* of *Equality*. For ſince (as your *Lordſhip* allows) the *Forms* of *Government*, and the *Perſons* of *Governours*, were always, ordinarily ſpeaking, of humane Determination; and theſe were certainly determined by *Societies* of Men merely in order for the greater Happineſs of *Society*, and for the good Execution of a particular Office: Since this is ſo, I ſay; ſuppoſing their *Authority* (upon ſuch *humane Appointment*) to be conveyed to them immediately from *God* himſelf, yet methinks, this *Authority* can be only ſuch as the Nature of their Office, and the Reaſon and Ground of the *Contract* ſuppoſed to be made with them, neceſſarily require. It will be very difficult, I believe, for your *Lordſhip* to prove, that God doth give any other *Authority* to the *Perſons* of *Governours*, but what is founded upon the *End* propoſed in their *Election*; or that they can be ſuperior to the whole electing *Society*, by his Will, in any Inſtances to which their *Commiſſion* doth not reach, and in which they deſtroy the very End of their *Commiſſion* given them by God, as well as of the Charge of *good Government* repoſed in them by this *Society*. Nay, your *Lordſhip* declares, that their *Commiſſion* from *God* is *limited*; and for one Purpoſe only: From whence it follows, that their *Superiority* is limited; and (to come to a plain Inſtance) that in the *Caſe* of *Governours* attempting the Ruine of a *Nation*, they are without *Commiſſion*, and ſo without *Superiority*; the Conſequence of which is, that, in this *Caſe*, *Self defenſe* is a moſt neceſſary and lawful Practice. There are *Kingdoms* which are *Elective:* as part of our own *Legiſlative Conſtitution* is. Now when the *Electors* of ſuch a *Kingdom* chuſe a *King*, expreſly to rule them according to their *eſtabliſhed Laws*; and he knows, and ſolemnly agrees to it; how can his *Commiſſion* from *God* be any other than to do ſo? And how can he pretend to any *Superiority* in doing the contrary? And how is it poſſible to ſuppoſe, that he hath immediately *Authority* from *God* to change this into an *Hereditary Kingdom*, by his own *Act*, and the People all obliged to ſubmit to ſuch a *Change*? How is it poſſible that he can have Authority to do this, unleſs it be in his *Commiſſion*? and which way it can be in his *Commiſſion*, it is paſt the Skill of the ableſt Head to determine, unleſs *God* can give a Man a *Commiſſion* to deſtroy thoſe very *Ends* for which he was elected; and which he voluntarily hath ſworn to anſwer. Again, who can imagine that our *Parliament*, choſen by the People to maintain our *Conſtitution*, and enact wholſom Laws, can receive immediately *Authority* from *God* to ruine it, if they think fit; and to conſent to the turning it into an *abſolute Monarchy*; nay, to the ſubjecting it to the *King* of *France*, or of any other *Country*; and the *People*, in a State of Damnation, unleſs they meekly ſubmit to all this, which neither *Elected* nor *Electors* ever dream't to be in their *Commiſſion*? Yet all this, and much more, if poſſible, doth your *Lordſhip* effectually affirm, whilſt you maintain the *Authority* of *Governours* to be ſuch, as that they can alter, annul, de-

deſtroy *Conſtitutions* by divine Right; and the *Slavery* of *People* to be ſuch, as that all muſt be patiently ſubmitted to. Theſe, *my Lord*, are aſtoniſhing *Poſitions*; ſuch as are void of all Proof, and indeed only affirmed by your *Lordſhip*, *Sermon*, 1704. p. 17, 18, 19. For my own Part, I muſt be ſo plain as to declare again, that I think it toucheth the Honour of *Almighty God* nearly, as well as the Happineſs of humane Society, to introduce him as granting ſuch *Commiſſions* to *Governours*; and affixing his *Seal* to what is contrary to his Will; as well as carries great Abſurdity along with it, to give them a *Superiority* in thoſe Points which abſolutely contradict their *Commiſſion*, and by this to take away from *Inferiors* all *Right* to *Self-defenſe* in all poſſible Caſes. This is what is not done, I think, in any *Caſe* but *this*, in which the doing it is of the moſt dangerous *Conſequence*.

7. This ſeems to me the Truth of the Matter. A *Community* or *Neighbourhood* of *People* living together, have a Right to defend themſelves againſt *Robbers*, and *Murtherers*, and *Enemies*; which includes ſuch Power over the Lives of them, as that they may deſtroy them whenever they, or any of them, meet with them. But finding this a *State* of no regular and eſtabliſhed Security, they reſolve to transfer this *Right* of *Self-defenſe*, or *Power* over the Lives of their *Enemies*, to ſome particular Perſons; reſerving only to themſelves the Exerciſe of *Self-defenſe*, in thoſe Caſes in which the *Magiſtrate* cannot act for their *ſafety*. This is allowed to particular Perſons in all *civil Governments* that are ſettled, in Caſe of *ſudden Attaques*: And for the ſame Reaſon muſt be allowed to the *Community*, when the *Magiſtrate* refuſes to guard againſt theſe *Enemies*; and much more when he joins with them to bring on Ruine and Deſtruction. This *Right* to *Self-defenſe*, in *Caſes* in which the *Magiſtrate* cannot defend the particular Members of it, was never given up to him by the Members of the *Community*: Nor was it ever ſuppoſed by any to be taken from them by God. And conſequently the Caſe of *Public impending Ruine* from the *Magiſtrate* himſelf being of the Number of *theſe*, this *Right* of *Defending* the *Community* in *this caſe* was never given away by it, or taken from it by *God*. From the whole I think it evident, that the *Magiſtrate* hath no *Authority*, properly ſpeaking, but what the whole *Community*, or *governed Society*, have in themſelves, ſuppoſing no *Magiſtrate*: and conſequently none but what may be transferred to *Him* by the *governed Society*. But if your *Lordſhip* ſtill be reſolved to date their *Commiſſions* from *Heaven*, and to affirm that they are immediately from God, accurately and properly ſpeaking, I muſt beg leave to reply, that this *Commiſſion* being, according to your *Lordſhip*, for the *civil Government* of the *Society* only, and *limited* to this Purpoſe; *God Almighty* may grant a *Commiſſion* to others for other Purpoſes, as your *Lordſhip* well argues: and conſequently, ſay I, He may, notwithſtanding this *Commiſſion* to the *Magiſtrate*, give a *Commiſſion*, for *ſelf-defenſe* and *ſelf-preſervation*, to the *Society* itſelf. And I will humbly preſume, that it hath pleaſed his Goodneſs actually to give this *Commiſſion* to the *Community*, till your *Lordſhip* is pleaſed to perform a Task ſo uſeful to humane *Society*, as to prove the contrary.

III. That your *Lordſhip* ſhould ſo poſitively confine St. *Paul*, to

have in his Eye the *Perſon* of the *Roman Emperor*, and him conſidered not only as a vicious Man, but a very bad *Governour*, is very ſtrange and unaccountable: When his Words are all manifeſtly applicable to the *Office* in general; when he declares, that there is no *Power*, no true *Magiſtratical Authority*, but of *God*, in which the *Senate*, how much ſoever their *Power* was impaired, and over-awed, muſt ſhare; and in which *deputed Governours* may juſtly claim a Part, agreeably to what our Lord told *Pilate*, one of them, that his Power was from above; and agreeably to thoſe other *Texts* which ſhew it to be the Concern of Chriſtianity, to preſs *ſubjection* to *Magiſtrates* of all Ranks, and which do command it in the ſame Words to the *ſupreme* and the *deputed Magiſtrates*. Nay, that St. *Polycarp* thus underſtood St. *Paul*, is plain from his applying the Expreſſion of *the Powers ordained of God* to the *Proconſul*, a *deputed Officer*. And that St. *Paul* deſigned what he ſaid, even to hold true of *Nero*, in his worſt *Character*, is what I hardly care to repeat. I rather chuſe to believe St. *Paul* himſelf, who aſſures me, and all who can read him, that he is ſpeaking of *Magiſtrates*, as a *Terror to evil Works, and a Praiſe to them that do well*, and endeavouring to reconcile ſome fooliſh Men to the *Office* as it is uſeful to *humane ſociety*, and not to the *Power* employed in deſtroying all the Ends that it is deſigned to anſwer. And if all the Wit of Man, or Art of *Logic*, can make St *Paul*'s Reaſoning conſiſtent, or tolerable, ſuppoſing him to ſpeak of *Nero* only, when he was, even in his own Conſcience, the Burthen of the Earth, and the Plague of *Society*, I will then believe any thing that can be affirmed of this Apoſtle. But otherwiſe, your *Lordſhip* will ſay, (as I ſee upon a like Occaſion) he could mean no *Magiſtrates* then living. What? were there no good Orders then kept at all? No deputed *Magiſtrates* who did their Duty tolerably? No Acts of the *Senate* to which your *Lordſhip* will allow any *Validity*? No Power which they claimed that was to be obeyed, becauſe in other things it was over-power'd by *Force* and *Bribery*? None to be ſpoken of to a few private *Chriſtians*, but the *ſupreme Head*, the great *Emperour*, of whom they knew little, and ſaw leſs? But ſuppoſing he was all that St. *Paul* had in View, might not this be written by him at the Beginning of his Reign, as hath been thought by good Judges, when he might be ſaid to anſwer St. *Paul*'s Character as well as moſt Princes? Can your *Lordſhip* demonſtrate that this was not the time of his Writing? And if it were, can your *Lordſhip* poſſibly think, that St. *Paul* would have ſaid the ſame of *him*, when the remains of *Power* in the *Senate* awoke, and ſought after him for *public Puniſhment*, which he ſaid when he was truly the *Officer* that he deſcribes a *Magiſtrate* to be? Let any one read the whole Paſſage in St. *Paul*, and try the Truth of what I have here alleged.

IV. In the *Third Inference* drawn by your *Lordſhip* from your Interpretation of the *Magiſtrate*'s being the *Miniſter* of *God*, p. 16. you lay the Duty of *abſolute Non-reſiſtance* upon the *governed Society*. For your *Lordſhip* argues, that *tho' the Laws of earthly Governours be contrary to the divine Laws (in which caſe the Magiſtrate doth certainly exceed the Bounds of his Commiſſion) yet this doth not void their Authority. They are the Miniſters of God for all this.* In what? I beſeech your *Lordſhip*.

Not

Not in this, I hope, in which they are without his *Commiſſion*; and in which they contradict his *Commiſſion*; in which they are without all *Authority*, either in making the *Law*, or in annexing the Penalty to it. They therefore who refuſe to ſubmit both to the *Law* and to the *Penalty*, do not reſiſt the *Authority* of *God* in this *caſe*, becauſe in this *caſe* there is none. But if your *Lordſhip* means, that they reſiſt a Perſon who is the *Miniſter* of *God* in other *caſes*, it is manifeſt this is allowed in the *caſe* of *Reſiſtance* to *Foreign Invaders*; and to a Parent who ſhould in a Fit of Madneſs command his Child to cut his *Brother*'s Throat, under Pain of having his own Throat cut if he did not. Here, my *Lord*, is an Inſtance ſufficient to prove that *Abſolute paſſive Obedience*, in ſome particular Caſes, is not due to a Perſon, who is the *Miniſter* of *God*, and acts by his *Commiſſion*, not in theſe but in others. The ſame may be proved from hence, that an *Eccleſiaſtical Miniſter*'s being the *Miniſter* of *God* for one Purpoſe, doth not make it a Duty to ſubmit to him in what he is not the *Miniſter* of *God*. All Arguments for *ſubmiſſion* in private Men to Puniſhments laid upon them without, and againſt the *Commiſſion* given to *Governours* by *God*, muſt be taken from *public* Good, and not from their having that *Authority* in other things, which they are allowed not to have in theſe. But here is the Caſe, Suppoſe the Matter toucheth the whole *Community*; and the Happineſs of that be invaded by a *Governour*, turned a *public Enemy* to it in the main part of his *Conduct*: Doth his having a *Commiſſion* from God for the contrary, make him not to be reſiſted in this? His *Authority* to rule well, which is all the *Authority* he ever had, is not indeed ſo made void, but that he hath that *Authority* as long as he hath Power. But if he cannot rule, without ruling to the Deſtruction of the Public, and to the univerſal Ruine of the *Community*, can it poſſibly be ſuppoſed, that it ſhould be *God*'s Will he ſhould ſtill bear rule, when he gave him a *Commiſſion* entirely for the *Good* of the *Community*, and for nothing elſe? Can it poſſibly be ſuppoſed that all Right to Self-preſervation and Self-defenſe is taken from this whole *Community*, at a time when they are in effect, without any eſtabliſhed *Governour* to defend and protect them? No more than it can be ſuppoſed that a Father, becauſe he hath a *divine Commiſſion* to rule his Family, is not to be guarded againſt, ſhould he be ſo diſtracted as to ſeek the Lives of his *Dependents*; or may not lawfully be put out of Rule, and Government; becauſe, as long as he hath Power, his *Authority* in thoſe Caſes, in which he hath *Authority*, is valid.

But if your *Lordſhip* recurr, as I ſee you do, to the general Declaration of St. *Paul* againſt *Reſiſtance*, I beg of your *Lordſhip* to give a fair Account of this way of Proceeding, and to prove plainly, why it is, that this *general prohibition* of St. *Paul*'s muſt be interpreted *abſolutely*, and declared to be without any *limitation*, when in our *Lord*'s own moſt expreſs *prohibition* of *Reſiſtance* in *Caſe* of *private Injuries*, *Limitations and Exceptions* are not only allowed, but contended for? Nay, when there are ſuch a Number of general *Precepts* and *Prohibitions* in which all admit, and plead for them. If your *Lordſhip* ſay, that *public Good* requires it, as you ſeem to ſay, when you

you tell us, *p.* 29. *That it is much for the Peoples good to be thus put in ſubjection to Magiſtrates*, you muſt give others leave to wonder how it can poſſibly be for the *Good* of the *People*, [i. e. every individual Perſon, of what Rank and Quality ſoever, beſides the *ſupreme Governour*] to ſuffer themſelves and their Poſterity to be made miſerable at the Will of the *ſupreme Governour*, when they ſee they can ſave themſelves if they will, and eſtabliſh a better State of Things. It is juſt as if a *Quaker* ſhould argue that it is for the *good* of all *private Men* that they are forbid abſolutely to reſiſt *Robbers* and *Cut-throats*; it is for their temporal Security and Proſperity to let them come into their Houſes and cut the Throats of themſelves, their Wives, and their Children, when they might prevent this if they would. It is for their good to be thus put in *Subjection* to their *Enemies*. But this I believe, with ſome ſort of *ſatisfaction*, that as *Nature* it ſelf will not ſuffer the *Quaker* to practiſe according to this Doctrine; ſo neither will the powerful *Law* of *Self-preſervation* ever ſuffer a *Nation* of Men, of the moſt *paſſive Principles*, to ſit down contented with their Ruine, when they have it in their Power to keep it off.

*My Lord*,

I will not trouble your *Lordſhip* much longer: but permit me to ſpeak a little freely, with all the deference due to your *Station*, and all that *reſpect* which I have for your Character. There was a Time, which muſt be ſtill freſh in your *Lordſhip's* Memory, when *Univerſal Ruine* was thought to hang over the whole *Community*. At this time the *People*, (which is not a contemptible Word, ſignifying only *Cobblers* and *Tinkers*, as ſome make it,) the *Lords*, the *Biſhops*, the *Gentry*, the *Commonalty*, were all under one common Senſe of Danger. Thoſe of the Higheſt as well as Holieſt Rank, and of the beſt Quality, invited over a *Prince* with armed Men, to awe their *Legal King*, and force him into a *Compliance*: and this they did in their private Capacity. Numbers joined themſelves to Him when He came. Nor do we account any part of our Excellent *Queen's* Behaviour more truly great; more lovely, or more beneficial, than the Part ſhe bore in this Tranſaction; when ſhe prefer'd the Safety of a Nation before all other Temporal Conſiderations; and encouraged by her Example this glorious Deſign. The ſame was done by ſome of my *Lords* the *Biſhops*, to their immortal Honour, with a Zeal beyond what is common. A *Revolution* ſucceeded, which your *Lordſhip* acknowledgeth to have wonderfully ſaved both *Church* and *State* from Ruine. Upon this Foundation is built all our Happineſs. To this we owe the preſent Felicity of a *Glorious* and *Beneficent* Reign. To this we owe that *Settlement* in the *Proteſtant Line*, for which your *Lordſhip* is an *Advocate*, even ſo far, as to wiſh it had been fixed many Years ago. And now, *my Lord*, how muſt it ſurprize all who can think, to hear it affirmed that it would have been *good* for the *People* to have acted as if they had been put under ſuch Subjection as your *Lordſhip* pleads for? That it would have been good for the Nation not to have invited over Arms, and not to have joined themſelves to them? And for their Temporal Advantage to have miſſed that opportunity, and to have ſit down contented with their Ruine, unleſs

Re-

*Regular Forms* prevented it? And how must it concern all good *Subjects*, to hear a Man of your *Lordship's* Character, and Authority, assuring the World, that her *Majesty*'s Title is only that of a *successful Usurpation*; that *Submission* to Her *Government* is indeed lawful, now it is *settled*; but that the *Foundation* of that *Settlement* was laid in a *damnable Sin*: to find that on a *Day*, set apart to celebrate the *Nation's* happiness in Her *Majesty*'s Accession to the Throne, a *Sentence* of *Condemnation* must be read against that *Resistance*, without which *She* had never enjoyed either the *Crown*, or perhaps Her Life; and all the *Nobility* and *Bishops*, and *others* who so bravely interposed, to secure the *Throne* for Her *Majesty*, and Her *Majesty* for the *Throne*, called, in effect, to Humiliation and Repentance? According to what your *Lordship* hath delivered, we ought all unanimously to move, that the *Fifth* of *November* may be changed into a Day of *solemn Humiliation and Fasting*, a Day of *Reproach* to the Nation, when the *Arms* of *Resistance* landed, upon the Invitation, and to the Satisfaction, of the whole *People*? For, upon your *Lordship's* Principles, it was a Guilt, not to be washed out in many Years, till grievously repented of: And to be visited in some terrible manner upon late Posterity; as some think it hath been upon our Selves by a long and expensive War. And I must observe, that if it were a *Guilt*, it was much more a *National Guilt*, than the *Murther* of K. *Ch.* I. For *this* we are assured by *Authority* was the Contrivance and Work of a few *Miscreants*, against the general bent of the *Nation*: Whereas the *Resistance* practised against K. *James* II. was the Contrivance and Work of all *Ranks* and *Orders* of Men, against the *bent* but of a very *few*.

But I know *your Lordship* is too well pleased with the *National* and *Beneficial Consequences* of this *Rebellion*, to proceed so far. Without it we had never had a *Queen*, so great an Ornament to the *Throne*; nor *Bishops* so great Ornaments to the *Mitre*; nor any thing of *Property* and *Protestantism* by this time left. And since this is so, *my Lord*; since these are the Benefits which the *Nation* hath reaped by *Resistance*; since to *Resistance* we owe that *Establishment* in the *Protestant Line* which your *Lordship* wisheth had been many Years ago made; since without it we had had an *Establishment* in the *Popish Line*, so much dreaded, I dare say, by your *Lordship*; I may ask, what harm hath *Resistance* lately done either to the *Queen*, the *Church*, or the *Nation*, that it must be thus run against with so unlimited a *Zeal*? And why should *that* be absolutely and entirely condemned as a *damnable Sin*, any more than *Church-Separation*, by which we got rid of the *Tyranny* of *Rome*. *This* is allowed to be lawful in some *Cases*; tho' the Allowance may be as much abused, and tho' *Schism* be as damnable a Sin: and can your *Lordship* tell why the same way of proceeding may not be allowed in the *Case* of *Resistance*? All *Separation* is not *Schism*; All *Church Reformation* is not *Church-Destruction*; All *Killing* is not *Murther*; All *speaking Evil* of a Man is not *Slander*; All *Swearing* is not a Violation of the *general Law* against *Swearing*; All *Resistance* to *private Injuries*, is not a Transgression of the *general Gospel-prohibition*: And can your *Lordship* tell

why all *Reſiſtance* in a whole Nation ſhould be called *Rebellion*, and the *Practiſers* and *Defenders* of it, in any *Caſe* whatſoever, be ſo often doomed to eternal Damnation? It is wholly unaccountable by all Rules of Interpreting the *Scripture*, and moral Prohibitions. But not more *unaccountable* than to eſtabliſh a *Government* by deſtroying the *Foundation* of it; to reconcile Men to an *Eſtabliſhment*, by condemning the Proceedings without which the *Eſtabliſhment* could not have been made; to be preaching up the moſt abſolute *Paſſive Obedience* under an *Adminiſtration* which needs not ſuch a Support, and which deſerves not ſo bad a *Complement*. But however; if your *Lordſhip* think it fit to endeavour to reconcile Men to the preſent *Conſtitution*, as far as your *Lordſhip* judgeth it proper, I hope you will pardon others, if they endeavour, by fair and calm Reaſoning, to make them love and approve the very *Ground* upon which it ſtands: and whilſt the *former* of theſe Methods can be applauded, it is to be hoped that, by all *candid Judges*, the *latter* will not be thought againſt the *Intereſt* of the *Nation*, or the *Government*. And as long as your *Lordſhip*, and thoſe of the ſame Mind, go on to defend and ſecure the *Eſtabliſhment*, by bringing an *Odium*, at the ſame time, upon the *Foundation* on which it is built; and making the *Goſpel* to patronize the moſt abject, and moſt univerſal Slavery; to the great Satisfaction and Mirth of the Common Enemies both of *Church* and *State* amongſt us: So long, I believe, I may aſſure your *Lordſhip*, there will be a Spirit in ſome others to take what care they can that the Foundation ſhall not be undermined, to the manifeſt Prejudice of that Eſtabliſhment; nor the Doctrine of Servitude impoſed upon whole Nations, to the Scandal of the *Church*, and the Diſgrace of *Chriſtianity*. And as particular Notice hath been taken, and diſtinct Replies given long ago to every Poſition of your *Lordſhip*'s, in favour of *Abſolute Non-reſiſtance*, as well as to every Argument that hath been urged by others; which will be eſteemed, by all good Judges, a great Advantage to the contrary Cauſe: So, I hope, the ſame Method will be taken for the future with all plainneſs, and all *Chriſtian Temper*. But I muſt obſerve, that neither your *Lordſhip*, nor any other Writer, hath ever attempted to diſprove thoſe Replies that have been given; or to advance any thing but poſitive and general Affirmations againſt them: which will be always a wonder to thoſe, who know that Truth fears not the Light; or rather, that the Darkneſs of every Falſhood will preſently vaniſh, when the Light of Truth is brought near it.

I beſeech your *Lordſhip* to pardon the trouble and boldneſs of this *Addreſs* from one whom a profound Veneration for your *Lordſhip* induced ſeriouſly to conſider what proceeded from ſo excellent and judicious a Perſon; and who aſſures your *Lordſhip*, with the utmoſt Sincerity, that He is, with a very high degree of *Reſpect* and *Eſteem*,

*My* Lord,

*Your* Lordſhip's *moſt Obedient*

*Humble Servant*,

FINIS. Benjamin Hoadly.

An Humble

# REPLY

TO THE

## Lord Bishop of *EXETER*, &c.

*My* Lord,

SInce your *Lordship* hath done me the Honour to Write a Reply with your own Hand to the *Considerations* which I presum'd to offer to you; I find my self under an Obligations on many accounts, to lay hold on the first opportunity of paying this Public regard to it: And this I hope and resolve to do, with all the marks of that Personal esteem which I have ever sincerely expres'd for your *Lordship*; with all that Veneration which I will ever maintain for your *Episcopal Character*; and with all that *Seriousness* which so Important a Subject requires: Being thoroughly persuaded within my self, that nothing can justify me in returning any thing unsuitable to that High and Holy *Station* in which the *Providence* of *God* hath plac'd your *Lordship*; or in handling a *Cause*, in which the Honour of *Religion*, and the Happiness of *Humane Society* are acknowledg'd, on all Hands, to be so nearly Concern'd, after a *Ludicrous* and *Sporting* manner. And the *Method* in which I propose to do it, I will now lay before your *Lordship* and the *Reader*; that it may be the better seen, whether I omit any thing material towards the doing all justice to your *Lordship*; or refuse to pay a due regard to any thing of Importance to the *Cause* in Hand.

I. I beg leave to give my own *Reasons* for having before troubled your *Lordship* in so Public a manner.

II. I am oblig'd by the Laws of *Common Juſtice*, to review all thoſe *Paſſages*, in which your *Lordſhip* complains that I have been guilty of *Miſrepreſenting* your Senſe, or of ſomething worſe:

III. I deſign to conſider again thoſe *Points*, which your *Lordſhip* hath endeavour'd to defend againſt the *Arguments* which I preſum'd to urge againſt them.

IV. I find my ſelf oblig'd to make an *Apology* for the *Concern* which I have ſhewn with Reſpect to the *Subject* now before us; and once more to ſpeak of the ſingular Importance of it to the preſent *Happy Eſtabliſhment*.

I. I beg leave to give my own *Reaſons* for having before troubled your *Lordſhip* in ſo Public a manner: And theſe were, the *Importance* of the *Matter*; the *Authority* of your *Lordſhip*; and the *Triumphs* of *Others*.

1. The *Importance* of the *Matter*; and this not only to your *Lordſhip*, or to my ſelf; but to the whole Nation of our *Fellow-Subjects*, who are all equally concern'd in this *Debate*. This your *Lordſhip* ſpeaks of more than once; and is free to acknowledge the *Queſtion* between us, to be of the utmoſt and moſt extenſive Importance: And therefore, ſince my *Conſcience* is as fully perſuaded of the *Truth* of what *I* have maintain'd, as your *Lordſhip* could poſſibly be of what *You* were pleas'd to Publiſh to the World; it is but a natural Conſequence of this Perſuaſion, that I ſhould repreſent to the World ſuch *Conſiderations* relating to this *Cauſe*, as appear'd to me of great moment; unleſs there were other more prevailing Reaſons to make it unneceſſary, or improper. But,

2. Your *Lordſhip*'s Great Reputation, and that wide Influence which the *Authority* of ſuch a *Name* carries with it, was ſo far from being an *Argument* againſt this, (which yet is the chief *Subject* of ſome Mens *Severity*) that it could not but help to determine me to it. There is but little danger, and little reaſon to appear, when Men, whoſe influence is very narrow, and whoſe Name carries but little impreſſion along with it, aſſert and maintain any *Doctrines* of Importance, which ſtand in need of an *Authority* to ſupport them, and make them ſpread. But when a Perſon, whoſe *Character* is Great and Powerful, Publickly aſſerts the ſame; the more *Veneration* is paid to his *Authority*, the more neceſſity is there, in proportion, publickly to examine the *Arguments*,

and

and try the *Foundations* upon which his *Assertions* are built. And I would appeal to those Persons themselves, who are now most offended upon this Head, whether, upon *Supposition* that your *Lordship* had maintain'd the contrary Doctrines to those which you have espoused, they would not be free to allow that the likelihood of many *Readers* being carried into such *Errors* by the *Magic* of a *Great Name*, was a powerful *Reason* why something should be offer'd to prevent this in as Public a manner as possible. Nor can I think it a sign of the least disrespect, but rather the contrary, that, having passed over so many, who have from time to time maintain'd the same *Doctrines*, I was induc'd, on this account, to address your *Lordship* in so public a manner. Nor indeed was it without Reason that I thus judged: For,

3. The *Boasts* and *Triumphs* of others confirm'd me in this *Judgment*, and still added to the necessity of my answering publickly to Such *Defiances* as were made on this Account. When your *Lordship*'s last *Accession Sermon* appear'd in Print, it was the general Discourse of many, that now there was no farther need of an *Answer* to any thing I had written concerning the *Measures* of *Submission*; that your *Lordship* had undertaken the *Cause*, and in a very few *Pages*, unanswerably demonstrated the weakness of my Principles; that since I had publickly appear'd on the contrary side, I ought now either publickly to acknowledge my self convinc'd, or shew the Reasons why I was not. My *Fate* indeed was very hard, that if I *did not* Answer, it should be esteem'd a proof that I *cou'd not*: And if I did, it should be esteem'd an Argument of nothing but want of Modesty and Humility. However, leaving such Persons to answer for their hard *Censures*, I thought it but due to their demands to give them the *Reasons* why *others* could not find that satisfaction in your *Lordship*'s Arguments which *they* expres'd; as well as to shew the unhappy influence of those Principles, of which they appear'd so fond, upon the present happy *Establishment*.

I know that where there hath been a particular and intimate Friendship, or great Personal Obligations, Decency seems to many to forbid a public Application. I confess I cannot see why; provided the *Question* be of the utmost Importance, and the Application made with *Civility* and *Respect*. But however that be; I must beg leave, for several good Reasons, to declare that I had no such considerations

ons to render mine the leſs Decent: Having never heretofore had the Honour of any particular or intimate acquaintance, or ſo much as of any *Converſation* with your *Lordſhip* but what hath been mix'd, general, and accidental.

This, my *Lord*, is the true account of the matter. Had the *Cauſe* been a *Cauſe* of Conſequence only to your *Lordſhip*, or my ſelf; or of any thing leſs than *Univerſal Importance*: Or had your *Lordſhip* been a Perſon of little or no Influence or *Authority* in the World; or had not many expreſs'd their Zeal againſt Men of contrary Principles upon this occaſion, and demanded an *Anſwer* to what they thought unanſwerable: I confeſs I think I might have been juſtly blam'd, had I not continu'd wholly Silent; or, had I not in a more private manner addreſs'd to your *Lordſhip*. And that this is the true account of my great, and, according to ſome Men, unpardonable Preſumption, I can produce very good Witneſſes, as unexceptionable to your *Lordſhip* as poſſible; who will teſtify with what *Reluctance* I enter'd upon the Work; nay, how much reſolv'd I was againſt a public Addreſs to your *Lordſhip* on this occaſion, till many *others*, as well as my ſelf, were ſatisfied that theſe were ſuch *Reaſons*, as made it not only *juſtifiable*, but *neceſſary*. How unkind therefore it is in your *Lordſhip* to repreſent me, as violently aſſaulting your *Lordſhip* merely becauſe you are an * *Eccleſiaſtical Governour*, and as thinking it agreeable to my own *Principles* to do ſo, is paſt my Skill to expreſs in Words. I muſt leave it to your *Lordſhip* to conſider to which of my *Principles* this is agreeable: Whether it follows from my aſſerting a *Right* in the whole *Govern'd Society* to preſerve it ſelf from being ruined by its *Civil Governours*, that I muſt therefore be ready to aſſault a *Biſhop*, merely *becauſe a Biſhop is thought by ſome People to be a ſort of an Eccleſiaſtical Governour*, as your *Lordſhip* expreſſeth your ſelf; or whether it follows from my having taken a great deal of Pains to vindicate the *Apoſtolical Inſtitution* of *Epiſcopal Government*, as to the *Eſſentials* of it; that I muſt therefore think it agreeable to my Principles, in your *Lordſhip*'s Phraſe, *to ſingle out and ſet upon a Biſhop rather than any other Man, that was more undoubtedly my Equal or Inferior*. And till it can be cleared, to which of my *Principles* it is agreeable, *violently to aſſault a Biſhop* merely becauſe he is a *Governor*; I hope

* *Anſ.* p. 10.

I hope I ſhall find ſo much favour with all *equitable Judges*, as to be believ'd, when I aſſure them that I have here given the true and only Reaſons of my troubling your *Lordſhip* in ſo public a manner: As I likewiſe hope that the differing from your *Lordſhip* in judgment, and the repreſenting the Ground of this difference to the World, will not paſs with every Body for a *violent aſſault* upon your *Lordſhip*.

As for the *manner* in which I have repreſented it; I am very ſenſible that in the haſt or heat of Writing, ſome *words* or *expreſſions* may eſcape, which had better not have been uſed: And as I never was unwilling to make all favourable allowances for others, ſo I ſhall ever acknowledge that I ſtand in need of them *my ſelf*. And therefore, if I have failed, in the leaſt degree, in *perſonal regard to your Lordſhip*, or in the reſpect due from an *Inferior* to a *Superior*; as I am ſure it is contrary to my deſign and reſolution, ſo am I ready to ask your *Lordſhip*'s forgiveneſs. If I have made uſe of any *word* or *expreſſion*, which may unneceſſarily, as well as undeſignedly, have proved diſguſtful to your *Lordſhip*, I am much more ready to retract it, than ever I was to inſert it. But if in the handling ſo weighty a *Subject*, or in my *zeal* to ſhew its Importance to the whole Nation in its preſent Condition, the *Argument* it ſelf preſſeth hard; I am not to be blam'd for that: Nor is this to be attributed to the want of *Reſpect* and *Civility*, but to the appearing *Cogency* of *Truth*, and *Reaſon*. This ſatisfaction, indeed, I have, upon the Review, that I don't find your *Lordſhip* can charge me with any Expreſſion inconſiſtent with a very great reſpect to your *Character* and *Station*; and on the other hand, that I perceive thoſe who have been pleaſed to ſpeak moſt freely of my *Impudence*, and I know not what, have not been able to point out any thing of that nature, but either the bare addreſſing to your *Lordſhip*, which I have now accounted for; or the preſſing an *Argument* farther than they could have wiſhed; or the ſhewing the ineſtimable Advantages of the late *Revolution*, and the *Eſtabliſhment* built upon it; and the evil Conſequence to the public Happineſs, of condemning a *Practice* which was the *foundation* of all the *Civil* happineſs which we have, or which we hope for. This, it ſeems, is the higheſt pitch of *Boldneſs*: And it is but *Modeſty* now at length to *forget*, and *forgive* thoſe who

ſaved

ſaved us! But I will not detain your *Lordſhip* any longer upon this Head.

II. I am now obliged, by the Laws of *Common Juſtice* to review all thoſe *paſſages*, in which your *Lordſhip* complains I have been guilty of miſrepreſenting your Senſe, or of ſomething worſe: And theſe I ſhall produce in the order in which I meet with them in your *Lordſhip*'s *Anſwer*.

1. In the *Conſiderations* which I preſumed to offer to your *Lordſhip*, p. 4. I have theſe words, *It deſerves ſeriouſly, and impartially, and frequently to be conſidered whether the Nature, and End of Government neceſſarily take away from the Governed part of Mankind, the Right of ſelf-Defenſe? or whether the Goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt hath utterly deprived them of any ſuch Right, and left them naked, and defenſeleſs againſt all poſſible attempts of their Governours?* Then I add, *your Lordſhip hath been pleaſed to expreſs ſome zeal for the affirmative ſide of theſe Queſtions.* To this your *Lordſhip* is pleaſed to ſay, *p. 6. A Notorious Falſhood! by meeting with which at the beginning of your Letter, your Reader may judge what fair Uſage of me, He is like to meet with in the reſt of it.* Before I reply to this, I beg leave to premiſe,

1. By *Self-Defenſe* here is to be underſtood, not that which your *Lordſhip* calls *Mere ſelf-Defenſe*, about which there never was any *Diſpute* between any two *Writers*, and which I ſhall by and by ſhew to be No *Real*, but only a *Nominal Self-Defenſe*; but *Self-Defenſe*, in the ſenſe in which I have all along uſed the word throughout theſe *Conſiderations*; in which it was ever underſtood in this *Controverſy*; and in which alone there ever was any Debate about it.

2. I did not repreſent it here, as a blameable, or unjuſtifiable Thing, to ſay that the *Goſpel* hath deprived Men of any *natural Right*; or forbid in ſome *Caſes* the exerciſe of any *natural Right*; as any one would think from your *Lordſhip*'s Anſwer, *p. 6.* On the Contrary, many will bear we Witneſs that I have often inculcated it, as a peculiar precept of the *Goſpel*, in many *Caſes*, to recede from what we think our *Right*, for the good of our *Brethren*, and the *Public happineſs*. But this is what I cannot think reaſonable; that, when the *inſiſting* upon a *Right*, and exerciſing it, is abſolutely neceſſary to the pre-

preſervation of the whole *Community*, in this *Caſe*, the ſame *Goſpel*, which never would have commanded the receding from the leaſt Right, but for the ſake of the good of others, and of *Public Happineſs*, ſhould be repreſented as forbidding us to make uſe of a moſt important *Right*, when *Public Good* moſt manifeſtly is deſtroyed without it. On the contrary, I think it more conſiſtent to found *both* upon the ſame *Public Good*: Judging from *that*, when it is the duty of a private Man to recede from his particular Right; and when it is fit for a whole *Community* to inſiſt upon what is a *Right* of general and univerſal importance. Having premiſed theſe two Obſervations, I come now to anſwer to this Charge. And,

1. What I here preſumed to fix upon your *Lordſhip*, doth not neceſſarily relate to the *Two Acceſſion-Sermons*: For I was not enter'd upon the examination of them, when I ſaid this. I am fully perſuaded that your *Lordſhip* hath, upon many occaſions, been a great *Advocate* for that *Abſolute-Paſſive-Obedience* in *Subjects*, conſidered as *Subjects*, and conſidered as *Chriſtians*, which takes away from them all *Right* to that *Self-Defenſe* by *Reſiſtance* which is neceſſary to the ſaving them from Ruine in ſome poſſible attempts of their *Governours*: And I know your *Lordſhip* hath expreſſed a great *zeal* againſt, ſuch as have endeavoured to argue the contrary from the *Nature* and *End* of *Government*, and to anſwer the *Texts* of *Scripture* alledged for it. And therefore I ſee not how it can deſerve ſuch a *Cenſure* to ſay ſo; except it may be accounted a *notorious Falſhood*, to expreſs your *ſenſe* truly without uſing your very words, where I don't pretend to uſe them; or to ſay in *general* that your *Lordſhip* hath expreſſed a zeal for a *Doctrine*, even ſuppoſing it be not in *this*, or *That*, particular diſcourſe, not yet expreſly refer'd to. But,

2. Your *Lordſhip* having produced my own *teſtimony*, that you have not touched upon the point of *Self-Defenſe*; and having thence infer'd the *Notorious Falſhood* of what I before had ſaid; I muſt therefore be at a little pains to explain what, I dare ſay, few ever imagined could be the ground of any ſuch Inference. In the *Conſiderations*, *p.* 15. I am returning, as I have been in the foregoing pages, an anſwer to your *Lordſhip*'s arguing from the *Magiſtrate*'s being called the *Miniſter* of *God*, againſt his being *Queſtioned*, *Cenſured*, or *Puniſhed*; or his being for

any thing *accountable* to any upon earth. And after I have ſhewn that even *this* doth not follow from his being called the *Miniſter* of *God*, I thought it proper to add that your *Lordſhip* had not touched upon the point of *Self-Defenſe*. Now whoever conſiders that I am here anſwering only to your *Lordſhip*'s way of managing one particular *argument*, cannot poſſibly imagine that I could intend any thing more in this, than that your *Lordſhip*, in that particular *argument*, about which only I was then *ſpeaking*, had not expreſsly handled the matter of *Self-Defenſe*, the very mention of which would perhaps have opened the eyes of many of your *Readers*: As I explain my ſelf in the next page, in theſe words. *And with ſubmiſſion, my Lord, if the Caſe had been put after this manner, &c.* But how it follows from hence, that it is a *notorious falſhood* to ſay that your *Lordſhip* hath, upon other *occaſions*, or in other *arguments* upon the like ſubject, or in other parts of this very *Sermon*, laid ſuch a *Duty* upon the *ſubject* part of Mankind as is inconſiſtent in ſome Caſes with *ſelf-defenſe*, or *ſelf-preſervation*, will be very hard to ſhew. Nay, I will go farther, and ſay that I may maintain that in the handling of this *particular Argument* your *Lordſhip* hath cautiouſly avoided touching upon the point of *Self-Defenſe*; (for my obſervation turns upon *that*) and yet without any inconſiſtency, and with a great deal of juſtice, may affirm that your *Lordſhip* hath endeavoured, under the *Colour* of other expreſſions not ſo eaſily ſeen through, (ſuch as *Cenſure*, *Puniſhment*, *Accountable*) to deveſt the *Governed* part of Mankind from all *Right* to any but a nominal *Self-Defenſe*: As I dare ſay, Your *Lordſhip* was underſtood by all, as well by thoſe who could, as by thoſe who could not, agree with your *Lordſhip* in this way of arguing. Not that I would have it thought that this is all I have to ſay for preſuming to tax your *Lordſhip* with a *zeal* againſt that *Self-Defenſe* about which only there ever was a *Conteſt*: For,

3. I am now going to appeal to theſe very *Sermons* themſelves, which gave occaſion to the whole *Debate*, and to produce ſuch *Paſſages* out of them, as may well juſtify me from this unkind Charge; and prove to the World that your *Lordſhip* hath effectually deveſted the *Governed* part of the World of all *Right* to *Self-Defenſe*. In that very part of your *Lordſhip*'s *Sermon*, 1708. in which you



infer

infer from the *Magistrates* being the *Minister* of *God*, that there is none upon Earth, to *Question*, *Censure*, or *Punish* him, your *Lordship* is not content with these words; but applies in the same unlimited manner those words of the *Apostle*, connecting them thus, *And whosoever resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God.* This I mention, not to find fault with the use of this expression of the *Apostles*: But to shew that a *Judicial Censuring*, and *Questioning* was not the chief thing in your *Lordship*'s Thoughts when you wrote that *Passage*; but that under the Patronage of those words the *Reader* was to be led to an inference against all *Self-Defense* by *Resistance*, as well as against all other *Censuring*, *Questioning*, *Punishing*. The same is plain from your *Lordship*'s Instance, *p.* 8. of a *Mayor* chosen by the *Members* of a *Corporation:* From which *Members* your *Lordship* doth there take away all *Right* to *Self-Defense*, except the *Right to complain of him, or bear witness against him*, to the *King* or *Queen*, in *case* of his *Misbehaviour*, who alone is *to judge whether he did Misbehave himself or not.* In this similitude, these *Members* of a *Corporation* answer to the *Governed part* of Mankind. The *Mayor* to the *Governour*, or *Governours.* The *King*, from whom his *Commission* comes, to *Almighty God*, from whom comes the *King*'s *Commission.* And is not the design of this *Similitude* plainly to devest the *Governed part* of Mankind (whose *Case* is made the same with that of these *Members* of a *Corporation*) of all *Right* to *Self-Defense* in the *extremest Cases*, unless it be by *complaining* and *bearing witness* against their *Governour*, to *Almighty God* from whom he had his *Authority*, and to whom only it belongs, according to this *Instance*, *to judge whether he Misbehave himself or not.* To go on to *p.* 9. of the same *Sermon.* When your *Lordship* comes to apply this *Instance* to the *Roman Emperours*, and to shew that *tho' they were chosen by the Army or Senate*, yet they were not *accountable* to them, or any upon Earth, nor to be *Censured*, *Questioned*, or *Punished* by any: I say, when your *Lordship* comes to shew this, you do it, not by inferring the absurdity of the *Senate* or *People*'s formally sitting in *Judgment* upon the *Emperour*, but by alleging that the *Apostle declares it to be unlawful for the Subjects to make Resistance, and denounces Damnation to such as dare to do it.* From whence it again appears that under the *Covert* of such words as *Censure*,

and *Puniſhment*, your *Lordſhip* meant to contend againſt all *Self Defenſe* by *Reſiſtance*: And that your *Lordſhip* had not in your thoughts a *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment* merely *Judicial*. And this *Argument* of your *Lordſhip*'s is, as you your ſelf in this *Anſwer* contend, taken from the *Nature*, and *End* of *Sovereign Authority*, as well as from the Words of St. *Paul*: Upon which account I hope I may here take the liberty of juſtifying what I once ſaid, and of ſaying it again, that your *Lordſhip* hath expreſſed ſome Zeal for theſe two points; *That the Nature, and End of Government, and the Goſpel of Chriſt, have deveſted the Governed part of Mankind of all Right to Self-Defenſe* in all poſſible *Caſes*, againſt their *Governours*. For I think I need go no farther than the management of this ſingle *Argument* to make it evident. The *Unlimited Paſſive Obedience* which your *Lordſhip* laith upon *Subjects*, in your *Third* inference, *p.* 16. is likewiſe inconſiſtent with all *Right* to *Real Self Defenſe* in ſome poſſible *attempts* of a *Governour*.

To come now to the former *Sermon* referr'd to in my *Conſiderations*; Give me leave to examine what ſort of Privileges your *Lordſhip* is pleaſed in that to allow to the *Governed* part of Mankind. P. 8. your *Lordſhip* explains to the *Subject*, the expreſſion *Fear the King, When thou can'ſt not obey, thou muſt ſubmit, and that not only becauſe thou canſt not help it, but altho' thou cou'dſt; if thou canſt not do as he bids thee, thou muſt take patiently the Puniſhment impos'd upon thee for thy diſobedience:* As likewiſe *p.* 13. *This is the Duty of Subjects*, your *Lordſhip* adds, to their *Governours*: Not in the leaſt excepting, or making allowance for, a *Caſe* that concerns the whole Body of *Subjects*; or making a difference between *that*, and a *Caſe* of the moſt private nature; as is plain from all your *Lordſhip*'s declarations on this head, and from your laſt *Anſwer*. Your *Lordſhip* goes on *p.* 9, 10. to preſs *Non-reſiſtance*, without any limitation. *Page* 12. your *Lordſhip* is very expreſs that *it is not true Religion, and a well-informed Conſcience, but an ignorant and miſguided Zeal, or a Form of Godlineſs without the Power of it that ever Arms ſubjects againſt their Sovereign*: This takes from the whole *Body* of *Subjects*, in the moſt extreme *Caſes*, all *Right* to *Self-Defenſe*. I paſs by your *Lordſhip*'s aſſerting, in this *Sermon* likewiſe, the *Supreme Civil Powers* to be *Unaccountable, Uncontroulable*, and the like; By which, it may appear

pear from what I before ſaid that your *Lordſhip* takes away from *Subjects* all *Right* to *Self-Defenſe* againſt them. I paſs by your *Lordſhip*'s laying the indiſpenſable Obligation, and that in repeated words, upon *Subjects* to Acquieſce, and ſubmit to all *Alterations* in the form of *Government*, of whatſoever ſort they be; and this *Obligation* deduc'd from the *Nature*, and *End* of the *Governing Power*; and ſhall only produce one *Sentence* more out of *p.* 28. where your *Lordſhip* is ſhewing *who they are* who, in a Criminal Senſe, are *given to Change*. *They eſpecially are moſt evidently given to Change, who, in caſe of any, whether true, or ſuppoſed, Diſorders of State, go out of their own way, and ſphere, to rectify or redreſs them: And this they certainly do, who being mere Subjects do uſe any other means to get their Grievances redreſſed, than only* PRAYERS *and* TEARS. In which words your *Lordſhip* doth effectually take from *Subjects* all *Right* to *Self-Defenſe* in all poſſible *Caſes:* Taking your Argument from the Nature of *Subjection*, and the State in which *Subjects*, as ſuch, are. Without looking, therefore, to any other of your *Lordſhip*'s declarations, but what are contain'd in theſe Two *Sermons*, I hope it appears from what I have produc'd in your own words, that I ſpake not without Reaſon when I ſaid that your *Lordſhip* had expreſs'd ſome Zeal for the *affirmative ſide* of the *Queſtions* I mention'd: For here it is evident that your *Lordſhip* hath endeavoured, both from the *Nature* and *End* of *Government*, and the declarations of the *Goſpel*, to argue the *Governed part* of Mankind out of all *Right* to *Self-Defenſe*, in all poſſible attempts of their *Governours*. And to deny this merely becauſe your *Lordſhip* hath never done it under the expreſs notion of *Self-Defenſe*, but by the help of other words ſignifying the ſame thing, is juſt as if I, ſuppoſing I had always avoided the word *Self-Defenſe*, ſhould deny that I ever pleaded for a *Right*, in *Subjects*, to *Self-Defenſe*, becauſe I never uſed that word, but the word *Reſiſtance*. For my pleading for their *Right* to *Reſiſt* in ſome *Caſes*, would not more effectually, upon this Suppoſition, prove that I had pleaded for their *Right* to *Self-Defenſe*, than your *Lordſhip*'s having pleaded abſolutely againſt their *Right* to *Reſiſt*, will prove that you have pleaded againſt their *Right* to *Self-Defenſe*.

4. Nor is your *Lordſhip*'s Mind at all altered: For in this very *Anſwer* with which you have Honour'd me; in this

this *Answer* in which your *Lordship* declares you will not touch the *matter* of *Self-Defense*, your *Lordship* hath amply *touched* upon it, and effectually deveſted the whole *Body* of *Subjects* of all *Right* to *Self-Defense*. Of which I ſhall give ſufficient proof before I conclude this trouble.

5. From all this appears the true meaning of your *Lordſhip*'s words, p. 7. *For (that I may not be wholy wanting in Conceſſions) I alſo am very free to grant that* Mere Self-Defenſe *is one of the moſt innocent means, that the governed part of the Society can ſometimes uſe, to preſerve it ſelf from Ruine and Deſtruction, in Caſe of ſome poſſible attempts of their Governours:* Which are enough to induce a *Reader*, who doth not carefully lay things together, to think that your *Lordſhip* here was willing to grant ſomething about which the *Debate* was. For if your *Lordſhip* doth truly make me a *Conceſſion*, or truly *grant* any thing; it muſt be ſomething which was contended for. And if your *Lordſhip grants* the lawfulneſs of that *Self-Defenſe* which I contended for, this will vindicate me from the heavy load which, in other places of your *Anſwer*, is laid upon me. But if your *Lordſhip* mean ſomething by *Self-Defenſe*, very different from what, it is plain from other Paſſages, your *Lordſhip* underſtands me to mean; and ſomething about which there never was any diſpute between any Two *Writers* in the World; then it is plain that your *Lordſhip* here makes no *Conceſſion* at all, and *grants* nothing at all. And indeed it is too evident from the following parts of your *Lordſhip*'s *Anſwer*, as well as from the *Paſſages* now produced out of the Two *Sermons*, that by *Mere Self-Defenſe* your *Lordſhip* here underſtands the *Self-Defenſe* of *Prayers* and *Tears*; that the *Self-Defenſe* here in words granted to *Governed Societies*, in order to ſave them from Ruine, is no more of *Self-Defenſe* than what is conſiſtent with their being *Ruin'd*, in many caſes; no more than what is conſiſtent with the moſt profound, moſt ready, moſt patient *Submiſſion* to all that Miſery which their *Governours* ſhall be determined to bring upon them. This is that *Mere Self-Defenſe* which your *Lordſhip* is *free* to *grant*; which is indeed no *Self-Defenſe* at all; or no ſuch *Self-Defenſe* as ever was the *ſubject* of any *Debate*, or *Controverſy*. And from all this it likewiſe appears that, at one time, your *Lordſhip* may in *words* grant a *Self-Defenſe*, without granting the *thing* meant by that word; and that at other

times,

times, your *Lordſhip* may in reality contend againſt the *thing* meant by it, without contending expreſsly againſt that *word*.

2. The next *Complaint* of *Miſrepreſentation* which I meet with, is in *pag.* 14. of your *Lordſhip*'s Anſwer: where it is ſaid, that you *can't but take notice of* my *foully miſrepreſenting* your *ſenſe when I ſay that* your *Lordſhip hath confined the Magiſtrate's Commiſſion to one purpoſe*: viz. *that of Civil Government*: Whereas your *Lordſhip* ſaith that you have, *in that very Sermon, expreſsly aſſerted that the Higheſt Power, or Supreme Magiſtrate, is Supreme Governour over all Perſons, and in all Cauſes.* Now, 1. Methinks I need not have incurred your *Lordſhip*'s diſpleaſure on this account, ſince my whole deſign in this paſſage was to follow your *Lordſhip* in that diſtinction made in your *Sermon*, *p.* 16, 17. between the *Commiſſion* given by *God*, to the *Civil Magiſtrate*, and *that* given by *God* to the *Biſhops*, and *Paſtors* of the *Chriſtian Church*; and ſince I could not be ſuppoſed to intend to fix any thing upon your *Lordſhip* but this *diſtinction*; my Argument in that place requiring nothing more. But ſince your *Lordſhip* hath been pleaſed to tax me, not with an involuntary miſtake, but with *foully miſrepreſenting* your ſenſe, I muſt, 2. Beg of your *Lordſhip* to conſider your own words, *p.* 16. of that *Sermon*, in which you ſay, That *God* hath *granted* to the *Civil Magiſtrate* a *Commiſſion* for *one purpoſe*. Theſe words, *for one purpoſe*, are your own words. And if *God* hath given a *Commiſſion* to the *Magiſtrate*, *not abſolute*, and *unlimited*, but for *one purpoſe*, What can the *one purpoſe* be for which He hath given a *Commiſſion* to the *Civil Magiſtrate*, but the purpoſe of *Civil Government*? If there be any *other purpoſe* for which He hath a *Divine Commiſſion*, yet ſince I was arguing with your *Lordſhip*, I had not fairly repreſented *your* ſenſe, unleſs I had limited his *Commiſſion* to *one purpoſe*, as your *Lordſhip* hath in *ſo many words done*. And if your *Lordſhip* had aſſigned Him a *Commiſſion* for more purpoſes than *one*, I ſhould have been free to ſay ſo. 3. I beſeech your *Lordſhip* to conſider likewiſe, whether the particulars which you afterwards name be any other but the parts of this *one general purpoſe*; or any more than what are implied in, and reſult from, his being *ſupreme Civil Governour*: Whether his being *ſupreme in all Cauſes, and over all Perſons*, be not the Conſequence of his being

*ſupreme*

*ſupreme Civil Governour*; or whether it implies in it a *Commiſſion* for every thing? 4. If your *Lordſhip*'s allowing the *Magiſtrate* to be *ſupreme in all Cauſes* (for which I ſhall ever be as free to contend as your *Lordſhip*) be ſufficient to ſhew that I have *miſrepreſented* your ſenſe when I ſay that you have confined his *Commiſſion* to *one purpoſe*; I ſee not how I could poſſibly have eſcaped this *ſevere Cenſure* any way. For, if I had ſaid that your *Lordſhip* gives him a *Divine Commiſſion* for *many diſtinct purpoſes*, (not implied in any *one general purpoſe*,) tho' not for *all* poſſible *purpoſes*; I might on the ſame grounds, have been taxed with *miſrepreſentation*; *viz.* becauſe your *Lordſhip* hath aſſerted that He is ſupreme in *all*, and not only in *many* Cauſes. And this Aſſertion of your *Lordſhip*'s, which you urge againſt my repreſentation of your ſenſe, would have ſerved as well to have confuted me, had I taxed your *Lordſhip* with ſaying that the *Magiſtrate* hath not a *Commiſſion* for *every purpoſe*, as it doth now that I have taxed your *Lordſhip* with confining his *Commiſſion* to *one purpoſe*. For it is equally conſiſtent, and equally inconſiſtent with both. If the *Magiſtrate*'s being *Supreme* in *all* Cauſes, relate at all to the *purpoſes* of his *Divine Commiſſion*, or contradict at all his having a *Divine Commiſſion* for *one purpoſe* only, (for which end your *Lordſhip* produceth it;) then it muſt ſignify that He hath a *Commiſſion* for *all* purpoſes. If it do not ſignify this; neither can it be proved from your *Lordſhip*'s aſſerting his *Supremacy* in *all* Cauſes, that I have miſrepreſented your ſenſe in fixing his *Commiſſion* to *one purpoſe*. And again, If I had argued from this expreſſion that your *Lordſhip* gave the *Magiſtrate* a *Commiſſion* for *all* purpoſes; there are many expreſs paſſages in your *Sermon* which would have proved that I miſrepreſented your *Lordſhip*. I appeal therefore to every *Reader*, and deſire to know what I could do more unexceptionable than what I did. I took your *Lordſhip*'s own words, for *one purpoſe*. If for *one purpoſe*; it muſt be that *general* one of *Civil Government*, and for every *particular* purpoſe included in that, or neceſſarily reſulting from it. And I uſed your *Lordſhip*'s own words for nothing but to introduce that *diſtinction* of *Commiſſions*, as to which your *Lordſhip* cannot complain of any *miſrepreſentation*: And therefore, I believe, may ſafely leave it to any one to determine whether I have here given occaſion to your *Lordſhip*'s *Charge*.

3. The

3. The *Manifeſt Falſification* charged upon me by your *Lordſhip*, *p.* 20. ſhall be conſidered under the *Third general Head*, when I come to the *Argumentative* part of your *Lordſhip*'s *Anſwer*.

4. P. 36. Your *Lordſhip* taxes me with *pleading your Authority for a thing which you never did, never meant to affirm in that latitude, in which I interpret your words. That there is no ſuch thing as a* Natural Right *to* Civil Government, your *Lordſhip*, I think, owns you have affirmed: But not that there never *was* in any a *Natural Right* to *Civil Government*. And it may be, I was miſtaken in underſtanding your *Lordſhip* to ſpeak of *Natural Right* in that extent: But if I was, I dare ſay it was a miſtake common to me with every individual Perſon who ever read the former of your *Lordſhip*'s *Acceſſion-Sermons*, without knowing any other of your *Lorſhdip*'s Sentiments upon that *ſubject* than what are to be met with there. Nay, let any one even now but read *page* 23. of that *Sermon*, and ſee if you do not there expreſs your ſelf as any one would do who deſign'd to ſpeak of *Natural Rights* in as much latitude as poſſible. Particularly, let him remark that your *Lordſhip* affirms *Inheritance* by *Primo-geniture* to be no *Law* of *Nature*, and that by *Nature* all *Children* have *Right alike* to their *Father*'s *real Eſtate*; and then judge whether your *Lordſhip* meant not to ſpeak of *Nature*, as it always was in all times, as well as with reſpect to the preſent Age. Beſides that I believe no one ever before undertook to ſpeak to this point, what the *Rights* of *Nature* are, without underſtanding the *Queſtion* to reſpect times *paſt* as well as *preſent*, and without being always underſtood ſo to do. I hope therefore that it was no *Crime* in me, to underſtand your *Lordſhip* as every *Reader* did; as without doubt your *Lordſhip* muſt have underſtood me, had I ſpoken of the *Natural Right* to *Government* in the ſame manner; or underſtanding your *Lordſhip* after this manner, to argue with you from your own *Principles*, which hath ever been accounted the moſt unexceptionable way of arguing.

5. P. 42. I am taxed with *inſinuating* a *Charge againſt* your *Lordſhip*, *utterly falſe, and groundleſs*, from p. 31. of the *Conſiderations*, to p. 35. The *Charge* which alone I there do (not *inſinuate*, but) expreſsly bring againſt your *Lordſhip*'s Doctrine, is, the giving the *Supreme Legiſlative Power* an *unlimited Authority* to make what changes

*that* ſees fit in the *Form* of *Government*; and particularly the giving to our *Houſe* of *Commons*, choſen by the *People* to maintain our happy Conſtitution, *Authority to ruine it, if they pleaſe, and to conſent to the turning it into an abſolute Monarchy*, &c. Thus are my words connected: From which it is plain that I make this the *Inſtance* in which your *Lordſhip* gives ſuch *Authority* to the *Houſe of Commons*; that I do not fix upon your *Lordſhip* the giving an Authority to that Houſe, to do it alone, but to do it by *conſenting* with the other parts of the *Legiſlature* in it. But it becomes me patiently to bear what your *Lordſhip* ſees fit to lay upon me. Now, *to paſs by that*, your *Lordſhip* anſwers, that you *may have ſaid*, that *a change made by Legiſlators*, &c. *is as regularly made as any ſuch change can be made*; *and that, being made, it is ſo far valid as to bind the Subjects. But that you did not ſay, that every ſuch change, only for its being made by the* Supreme Legiſlative Power, *muſt needs have been neceſſary, juſt, and reaſonable in it ſelf.* By which words the Reader muſt be led to think that I have taxed your *Lordſhip* with ſaying that all *Alterations* made by the *Supreme Power* are for that Reaſon *neceſſary*, *juſt*, and *reaſonable* in themſelves: Whereas your *Lordſhip* knows that I never did any thing like it. But this indeed I have ſaid, That your *Lordſhip* hath given an *Authority* to the *Supreme Legiſlative Power* to make even ſuch *changes* as are not only *not juſt* and *reaſonable* in themſelves, but of *fatal Conſequence* to the whole *Governed Society*; which is a point vaſtly different. And leaſt your *Lordſhip*'s Authority ſhould influence your *Reader* to believe that this is all *Miſrepreſentation* in me, and that what you have ſaid, is only this, That *changes* ſo made are as *regularly* made as any ſuch *changes* can be; I muſt here be forc'd to appeal once more to the *Sermon* it ſelf. And,

1. I might here argue from the deſign of your *Lordſhip* in that *Sermon*, which cannot be anſwered in the leaſt, without ſuppoſing that in thoſe frequent Declarations, that the *Legiſlative Power may make all Alterations*, one as well as another, which to it ſelf ſhall ſeem fit, your *Lordſhip* intended that *may* ſhould ſignify *may lawfully*, and agreeably to its *Commiſſion*. Otherwiſe your *Lordſhip* could not have concluded from hence, what you deſign'd ſhould follow. For it is of no importance to allege that, The *Supreme Legiſlative Power may make any Altera-*

*Alterations*; and this ſolely in order to prove that they had *Authority* to make one particular *Alteration*, unleſs by *may* be underſtood, *may lawfully and warrantably*. Put the Caſe, that I ſhould endeavour to prove that the whole *Nation* might lawfully have reſiſted a late *Prince*, by firſt laying it down that a Nation *may* defend it ſelf from ruine: Could this be to the purpoſe, unleſs by *may*, I underſtand, *may lawfully?* And would not all the World have ſo underſtood me? Nor can your *Lordſhip* indeed be otherwiſe underſtood by any *Reader* that looks into the whole Paſſage.

2. But this is not all. I have not only this *Argument* to urge, in vindication of my ſelf; but your *Lordſhip*'s own expreſs aſſertions. If the *Reader* will but conſult p. 18. of that *Sermon* he will find theſe words. *Thus I think it is evident that no change or alteration of the form of Government from one ſort to another, is in it ſelf unlawful to be made, provided it be made by them who have Power to make it; that is, by the Government it ſelf, I mean by Him, or Them, who for the time being have the Sovereign Power in their hands.* If he go on to *page* 21. He will find theſe words. *Whenever therefore the Supreme Power of any Nation undertakes to make any Change in the Eſtabliſhed Form of Government, they ought in prudence —— to be well aſſured, that there will be more good than hurt in it: But when they are well ſatisfied in this, they may then, without breach of Duty or Juſtice, make ſuch Alterations therein as they judge needfull; they do no more than they have full Power and Authority to do in making ſuch a Change*, &c. Here, my *Lord*, it is left entirely to the *Legiſlative Power* to make what *Alterations* they think fit ſo far as that what change ſoever they themſelves are ſatisfied hath more good than hurt in it, (whether it be really ruine to the *Nation* or not;) they are declared to have not only *Power* but *Authority* to make. I will mention but one Paſſage more in which your *Lordſhip* recapitulates your own ſenſe, p. 26. in theſe following words. *Thus I think I have made it appear, that this precept*, Meddle not with them that are given to change, *doth not teach the Duty of Sovereign Powers, who may lawfully make what Changes and Alterations in the frame and conſtitution of the Government they themſelves think fit.* In theſe *Sentences*, your *Lordſhip* hath declared that the *Legiſlative* may *lawfully* make any change they ſee fit; that no change is unlawful to be made,

which they ſee fit to make; and that they have *Authority* (this is the very word) to make any *Change*, if ſo be that *they themſelves* be perſuaded of the neceſſity and expedience of it. And now, I will appeal to this very *Reader*, whether, in this, I brought againſt your *Lordſhip*, a *Charge utterly falſe, and groundleſs*.

There is one thing which, before I leave this matter, I muſt take notice of, and that is, That your *Lordſhip* here, p. 45. ſpeaks as if I contended that no *Alterations* in the *Conſtitution* cou'd be *Authoritatively* made without ſummoning the whole *People* together. But whence your *Lordſhip* could collect this I cannot ſee. I never ſaid any ſuch thing in plain words. All that I have done towards it, is the maintaining that it is not in their *Commiſſion*, and that they have no *Authority*, properly ſo called, to make any *alteration* for the *Ruine* of the *whole Nation*. And I am extremely unfortunate, if it muſt be admitted for a good Argument, that becauſe I hold that the *Legiſlators* have no *Authority* to make a Deſtructive Alteration, therefore I muſt hold they have no *Authority* to make any that are beneficial; that becauſe I maintain that they have no *Commiſſion* to make Laws to the Ruine of the Nation, therefore I muſt hold that they have no *Commiſſion* to make uſeful ones; that becauſe I argue againſt their *Authority* to change this into an *abſolute Monarchy*, therefore I deny them an *Authority* to limit the *Crown* to the *Proteſtant Succeſſion*. Theſe *Conſequences* are ſo far from being juſt, that, on the contrary, it unavoidably follows from my *Principles*, and hath been aſſerted by me in words, that they have a full *Authority* to make all Alterations for the ſecurity, and happineſs of the *Nation*. Yet *theſe*, and the like *Conſequences* are urged by your *Lordſhip*, and others who have undertaken to vindicate your Cauſe, as if there were no *Medium* between allowing to *Governours* an *unlimited Authority*, and *no Authority* at all: Or as if, becauſe I do not allow an *Authority* to make pernicious *Alterations*; therefore I grant them no *Authority* to make ſo uſeful ones, as the *Union* of the two *Kingdoms*; or the *Limitation* of the *Succeſſion*. No, *my Lord*, I never thus pleaded for the *People*, tho' I have been thus repreſented. I plead for a *Right* in the *whole Body* indeed to defend it ſelf from *Ruine*, ſhould *Public Ruine* be Enacted. But in all ordinary and private *Caſes*, I leave the *Government* to determine them. In all good and beneficial Laws,

I give

I give *Governours* an *Authority* properly ſo called; an *Authority* as great as poſſible; implied in their *general Commiſſion* to conſult the good of the *Public*, and reſulting from the manifeſt *End* of their Office. In others, I *cannot*, becauſe of the *Abſurdity*; I *dare not*, becauſe of the *Blaſphemy*. And I am the more free to ſpeak thus, becauſe I have the ſatisfaction to find your *Lordſhip* now ſo far of my Mind, as to be unwilling that the *Reader* ſhould think that ever You had given them ſo *unlimited* an *Authority*; tho' I have been forced in my own defenſe to produce the *Paſſages* in which you did ſo. And notwithſtanding what your *Lordſhip* ſaith, p. 45, 46. to which I intreat the *Reader* to have recourſe, the only remaining difference between your *Lordſhip* and me, ſeems to be this. Your *Lordſhip* maintains, with reſpect to ſuch *Alterations*, and *Laws*, made without *Authority*, as are certainly deſtructive to the whole *Community*, that there remains no *Defenſe* in the whole *Body*, but that of *Prayers* and *Tears*: And I, on the contrary, do preſume to allow this whole *Community* to defend it ſelf by other means againſt *Ruine*, tho' coming upon it from thoſe hands, which were entruſted with Power only for its preſervation.

6. But the greateſt Cauſe of your *Lordſhip*'s Complaint againſt me is yet behind. For, *Anſwer*, p. 51. I am accuſed of making my *Letter all of a piece, by ending it as it began, with a foul, and falſe Charge upon* your Lordſhip, *viz.* for ſaying; that your Lordſhip *hath aſſured the World that her Majeſty's Title, is only that of a ſucceſsful Uſurpation.* I preſume, my *Lord*, No one who hath read what I have in this Paper already ſaid, in my own vindication, will eaſily call the *Charge* with which my *Letter* began, *a foul, and falſe Charge*. I have proved that it is not a *falſe Charge*: And I am very well aſſured from the whole tenour of this *Anſwer*, that your *Lordſhip* accounts it no *foul* one, to be taxed with the maintaining ſuch a *Paſſive Obedience* as takes away from *Subjects* all right to *Self-Defenſe* againſt all attempts of their *Governours*. I hope now, with all *ſubmiſſion*, to ſhew that my *Letter* was *all of a piece*, ending, as it began, with a *Charge* which I had but too juſt reaſon to make. But before I do this, I ſhall only beg leave to aſſure your *Lordſhip* that I mentioned not this with the leaſt deſign of laying any thing to your *Lordſhip*'s Charge, which might ſeem *obnoxious*, or any thing in which many

others

others do not ſhare with your *Lordſhip*. Alas! my *Lord*, The *Government* is ſtill treated as a Mere *De Facto* Government, (which I take to be another word for *Uſurped*) by many who take the *Oaths* to it, and who plead for *Submiſſion* to it: And this merely becauſe the whole *Body* of *Subjects* are not allowed, in any *Caſe*, to make one ſtep, but in the ordinary legal Methods. And finding ſo many very free without ſcruple to maintain this to be a *De Facto* Government, that is, in other words, a *Government* founded upon *Uſurpation*, I had not the leaſt ſuſpicion, nor do I now apprehend, that any ſuch Perſons ſtood in need of an *Act* of *Indemnity*, or incurr'd the leaſt *penalty* by ſo doing: Nor could I think that any whoſe *Principles* plainly lead to it, would think it *grievous* to have it ſaid ſo. But I confeſs, ſo deep is the ſenſe I have of the public happineſs reſtored, and eſtabliſhed, under God, by the *Revolution*; and ſo cloſe is the connexion between the preſent *Settlement*, and that *Reſiſtance* which brought it about; that I cannot help expreſſing a *concern* againſt the *Principles* which would bring a diſreſpect upon *that*, and which by ſhaking *that* muſt inevitably ſhake the whole Fabrick built upon it. But I do not deſign by all this merely to avoid your *Lordſhip*'s Charge: But come now to the point.

And, in order to my own Juſtification, I muſt beg leave to tranſcribe that whole *Sentence* of mine of which your *Lordſhip* hath mentioned only a part. In *p.* 46. of the *Conſiderations*, I expreſs a concern, in the following words, *to hear a Man of your Lordſhip's Character and Authority, aſſuring the World that her Majeſty's Title is only that of a ſucceſsful Uſurpation; that ſubmiſſion to her Government is indeed lawful now it is ſettled; but that the foundation of that ſettlement was laid in a damnable ſin.* In which words of mine there is not only the *Charge* it ſelf; but the explication of what I meant in it is plainly added. For I do not barely tax your *Lordſhip* with *aſſuring the World that her Majeſty's Title is only that of a ſucceſsful Uſurpation*, but I add the very way in which you have done this, *viz.* by aſſuring them that tho' *Submiſſion* to her *Government* be lawful, yet the *foundation* of it was laid in a damnable Sin: Which laſt words being an explication of the former, if they had been favourably produced by your *Lordſhip*, as indeed they might have been, would have acquitted me of all *Crime* in ſaying what I did.

1. There-

1. Therefore, I anſwer, that I do no where lay it to your *Lordſhip*'s charge that you do, in ſo many words, *aſſure the World that her Majeſty's Title is only that of a ſucceſsful Uſurpation.* I appeal to every individual *Reader*, whether they did, or could underſtand me ſo; or after any other manner than that this is the natural Conſequence, the unavoidable Concluſion from your *Lordſhip*'s Principles, in the manner in which I have there explained my ſelf. I never heard of any *Reader* who hath ſo underſtood me; and therefore I may ſay, I have never repreſented your *Lordſhip* to any *Reader*, as ſaying this in ſo many words. If there be any, as I do not believe there are; I am here ready to declare publicly, that they have miſtaken my meaning, by not attending to my own explication; and that your *Lordſhip* hath never, in ſo many words, declared her *Majeſty*'s Title to be that of a *Succeſsful Uſurpation.*

2. I appeal to your *Lordſhip* your ſelf, who, I dare ſay, notwithſtanding all the *Concern* expreſſed on this occaſion, did not, and cannot, think that I meant to tax you with the ſaying this in ſo many words. This is plain enough from your *Lordſhip*'s declaring againſt all *Innuendo-proofs:* Which will ſatisfy every body that you underſtood me no otherwiſe than as ſpeaking of the *Conſequences* of your *Lordſhip*'s Principles. And why then ſhould your *Lordſhip* expect me to ſhew, *in what Sermon, and in what Page,* you *have plainly ſaid theſe words,* when I do not once tax your *Lordſhip* with *ſaying theſe words*; When no *Reader* ever, I believe, underſtood me to tax you with it; Nay, when I am fully perſuaded that you your ſelf was all the time inwardly ſatisfied that I did not mean to do it? There are other ways, my *Lord*, of *aſſuring* the World of this, beſides *plainly ſaying theſe very words.* The Men, whoſe Conſciences will not permit them ſo much as to *ſubmit* to the *Queen*'s Government; That *Writer* in particular, who, under the bold pretenſe of vindicating your *Lordſhip*, hath vented all his ſpleen againſt our *Eſtabliſhment*, will not perhaps uſe theſe very words. But yet I can't think that they would take it for a *miſrepreſentation*, ſhould I ſay, that they have *aſſured the World that her Majeſty's Title is only that of a ſucceſsful Uſurpation.* It is far from my heart to make your *Lordſhip* reſponſible for any thing Men of thoſe Principles write, tho' under the covert of your

*Great*

*Great Name:* But I only mention this that any one may ſee that my manner of expreſſion here is very juſtifiable, by all the *Rules* of ſpeaking, tho' your *Lordſhip*, I verily believe, hath never *plainly ſaid thoſe very words.*

3. I come now to prove what I ſaid not to have been groundleſs, or unjuſtifiable; *viz.* that your *Lordſhip hath aſſured the World that her Majeſty's Title is only that of a Succeſsful Uſurpation*, in that ſenſe, in which, the next words explain it, and in which every one underſtood me to mean it. And this I ſhall do, not by *Innuendo's*, but by plain *Argument*, and *Syllogiſm*, too obvious to every eye, and differing very much from proof by *Innuendo's*, in the certain, and undeniable concluſiveneſs of it. My Argument is this. Your *Lordſhip hath aſſured the World that all Reſiſtance is a damnable ſin. But the foundation of the preſent Settlement was laid in Reſiſtance. Conſequently, your Lordſhip hath aſſured the World that the foundation of this Settlement was laid in a damnable Sin.* Or again thus, Your *Lordſhip* hath aſſured the World that all taking Arms, or adhering to thoſe who are in Arms, againſt their *Sovereign*, is a damnable ſin in *Subjects*. But our preſent Settlement, and the *Queen*'s Government, is owing ſo entirely to this taking up Arms, and adhering to ſuch as were in Arms againſt the *Sovereign*, that it would have utterly been prevented without it. Conſequently, your *Lordſhip* hath aſſured the World that the *Foundation* of the *Queen*'s Title was laid in a damnable ſin, that is, in other words, is only that of a *Succeſsful Uſurpation.* Nor do I find that your *Lordſhip* would even now have it thought, that you have not effectually aſſured the World that this *foundation* was *laid in a damnable ſin.* For in this *Anſwer*, tho' not under the expreſs notion of a *Revolution*; yet under *that* of *Reſiſtance* your *Lordſhip* hath as amply, and effectually condemned all the firſt ſteps in it, as words can do it. And now, my *Lord*, ſince this is the *Uſurpation* I ſpeak of; ſince I explained my ſelf thus in the ſame Sentence, in which I taxed your *Lordſhip* with this; ſince the reaſoning Men into this perſuaſion, by laying down ſuch *Premiſes* as neceſſarily, and not by the help of *Innuendo's*, infer ſuch a *Concluſion*, is the moſt effectual way of *aſſuring* them of this, and of leaving the impreſſion deep upon their minds: All the *Rules* of *Speaking*, and of *Syllogiſm*, will bear me out in the truth of what I alleged;

and

and the great importance of the matter to the *Nation*, will bear me out in taking notice of it.

4: The *Malignant Influences* which the *Principles* of *Unlimited Non-resistance* reflect back upon the *foundation* of the *Queen*'s *Government*, and the *Protestant Succession*, will appear the more plainly, if we compare it with the more *benign* and *kindly influences* of the *contrary*. For permit us, My Lord, only to suppose, for the present, that, on extraordinary Occasions, extraordinary Methods are allowable; permit us only to suppose it lawfull for a *People* to preserve themselves from imminent ruine by *Methods* not be justified upon less occasions: And see if an easy and beneficial *Scheme* doth not present it self to view. For, 1. That very extraordinary occasion, which was apparent to every eye, when we were in the extremest danger of *Popery*, and *Arbitrary Power*, will justify his late *Majesty*, in hearing the Cries, and pitying the Distress of a *People* in the last pangs of *Life*; in either kindly listening to the invitations of as many as had opportunity, and courage, to speak, or Nobly offering the hazard of his own *Life and Fortunes*, to assist this *Nation* in preserving it self from ruine. 2. The same extraordinary occasion will vindicate from all reproach the *Conduct* of Her present *Majesty*, then *Princess* of *Denmark*; and add a never-fading lustre to the part which SHE bare in the same glorious design: When, moved by a deep sense of the *Miseries* hanging over Her Native *Country*, and by a tender compassion to the present and succeeding Generations, *SHE* generously sacrificed every other conside-

ration to the Security of that *People*, in whoſe Hearts *SHE* now Reigns; receiving back again the genuine rewards of Her *paſt Compaſſion*, and Her *preſent Cares*, in the moſt ſubſtantial marks of their ſincereſt *Love*, and *Gratitude*. 3. This very extraordinary occaſion will likewiſe juſtify the *People* of all Ranks and Conditions, from the higheſt and holieſt Order, to the meaneſt and moſt ſecular employment, in joining themſelves to thoſe *Arms* of the *Prince* of *Orange* to which we owe the late *Revolution*. 4. The greatneſs of the occaſion will likewiſe juſtify the *Lords* for aſſembling themſelves, and the *People* for chuſing *Repreſentatives*, to conſult what to do in ſo critical a juncture. 5. The Experience of what had been deſign'd, and put in practice, againſt the ſafety of the *Nation*; and the difficulties likely to ſtart up on ſuch an occaſion, will give a *Right* to theſe *Noble Lords* and *Repreſentatives*, to go out of the *ordinary Methods*, and conſent to inveſt K. *William*, and Q. *Mary* with the *Supreme Executive Power*. 6. This *Conſent* will give an undoubted *Title* to K. *William*, and Q. *Mary*; a *Right* much more apparent than the *Right* by which moſt of the *Kings* of this World Reign. 7. This *Conſent*, and the *Neceſſity* of the *Caſe*, will give a true, and juſt *Authority*, properly ſo called, to all the *Acts* paſſed by *Them*, and theſe ſame *Lords*, and *Commons*, for the Security of the *Public Happineſs*: particulary to that *Act* concerning the *Settlement* and *Limitation* of the *Succeſſion* to the *Crown*, upon which, I think, * your *Lordſhip* allows the *Queen*'s Title to be founded. 8. This, conſequently, gives an undoubted *Right* to Her *Majeſty*, who, by virtue of all theſe ſteps, is in the

* *Anſw.* p. 27.

the Throne, and without them had never been in it: A *Right* which is equally a glory to *Her ſelf*, and a ſatisfaction to Her *Subjects!*

On the contrary, ſuppoſing no allowance to be given by *Almighty God*, no liberty to be granted, to a *People* once under any *Eſtabliſhed Form* of *Government*, to depart from the *ſettled* and *general Rule* of *Obedience*; even in order to ſave themſelves from manifeſt Ruine, and Univerſal Unhappineſs: Some very hard, and very unkind *Conſequences* will follow from hence; I fear, not to the advantage either of the *preſent Settlement* in *general*, or Her *Majeſty*'s *Government* in particular. For, 1. The worſt of *Reproaches* muſt fall upon the Memory of our *Late Deliverer:* And his *Character* muſt be drawn, with that of the *worſt* of Men, to the greateſt diſadvantage poſſible. He muſt be thought void of all *Apology*, and *Excuſe*, to tempt a *Nation* from its Obedience, and to ſave a *People* by the *Arms* of *Terror* and *Reſiſtance*, inſtead of leaving them to their only *Refuge* of *Prayers* and *Tears*. 2. Nor can it fare much better, upon this *Principle*, with our preſent Gracious *Queen*, who, tho' at that time a *Subject*, yet, thought the ſafety of a whole *Nation* not unworthy of her regard; and eſteemed it a ſufficient motive to induce *Her* to encourage by Her great Example the *Cauſe* of juſt *Liberty*. 3. Neither can any of thoſe be acquitted from guilt, who joined themſelves to the *Prince*'s *Arms*. 4. Neither can the *Lords* be, by this means, juſtified in Aſſembling themſelves; or the *People* for chuſing *Repreſentatives:* Since being all *Mere Subjects* they had no *Right* to act ſuch a part. 5. Nor would this *Principle* have ſuffered theſe *Noble Lords*, and *Repreſentatives*, by their *Conſent* to make a *King:* Since there was

*one* in being, whom no *Miſmanagement* could deveſt of his *Right*; and ſince they themſelves being ſtill but *Subjects*, according to this *Principle*, were not authorized by *God* to redreſs the *Grievances* either of themſelves, or their Neighbours, in ſo extraordinary a manner. 6. Neither would this ſame *Doctrine* have ſuffered any *Right* to be conveyed to K. *William*, and Q. *Mary*, to poſſeſs the *Government* at that time; or have *juſtified them* in poſſeſſing it, or that *Parliament* in joining with them in any *Acts*. 7. What *Authority* therefore, properly ſo called, will this *Principle* allow to their *Acts*, which it laboured to prevent; and which it would have prevented, if it had been poſſible? 8. What influence muſt it have upon the *preſent Settlement*, by which Her *Majeſty* Reigns; when it leads People inevitably to judge that all the *ſteps* leading to this *Settlement* were diſpleaſing to *God*; contrary to the *Duty* of the *Nation*; inconſiſtent with the obligations of *Subjects*; and ſuch as, even under this very *Settlement*, deſerve in the moſt public and ſolemn manner to be condemned; and their *Defenders* and *Adherents* to be *anathematized* by the *Preachers* of the *Goſpel* of *Jeſus Chriſt*?

Let any one but ſedately compare theſe two *Schemes* together, and he will not be long determining which *Principle* it is that hath the beſt influence upon our preſent happy *Settlement*. Nor will he, I believe, doubt to juſtify me for ſaying that They who allow no *Right* to the *People* thus to go out of the ordinary ſettled *methods*, upon the greateſt occaſion, cannot poſſibly allow any better Title to the *preſent Settlement* than that of a *ſucceſsful Uſurpation*. Thus, my *Lord*, I humbly hope, I have given ſome tolerable account of what I fixed upon your *Lordſhip*; and this not

by

by *Innuendo's*, but by way of plain, neceſſary, unavoidable *Concluſion*, drawn, without artifice, or the leaſt ſtraining, from your avowed *Principles*.

This was the *Second* Point I undertook in this *new Trouble* which I am forced to give your *Lordſhip*, *viz.* To review all thoſe *Paſſages*, in which your *Lordſhip* complains that I have been guilty of *Miſrepreſentation*, or ſomething worſe. And having gone over every particular inſtance minutely, and diſtinctly; as being much leſs willing to be thought Criminal in ſuch a point, than merely *Erroneous* in all others; I have nothing farther to add to this neceſſary, and plain *Self-Defenſe*.

III. I come now to conſider again thoſe Points which your *Lordſhip* hath endeavoured to defend againſt the Arguments which I preſumed to urge againſt them.

*Firſt. Conſiderations*, p. 9. I am arguing againſt your *Lordſhip*'s inferring from the *Magiſtrate*'s being the *Miniſter* of *God*, that he is, on that account, in ſuch ſenſe *Supreme*, as that none upon Earth can lawfully *Queſtion*, *Cenſure*, *Puniſh*, or *Reſiſt* him; * which laſt your *Lordſhip* is carefull to join to the foregoing words, in the ſame *Argument*; by which it appears what ſort of *Queſtioning*, *Cenſuring*, or *Puniſhing* your *Lordſhip* meant. Againſt this I urged, 1. That he is declared to be not only the *Miniſter* of *God*, but the *Miniſter* of *God* to us *for good*. Suppoſing him, therefore, ordain'd immediately by *God* for the good of Society; it will not follow that He is *unaccountable* to any upon Earth in attempting the *Ruine* of *Humane Society*, any more than it will follow that being *ordained* for the *Good*, He was likewiſe *ordained* for the *Ruine* of Mankind. I am ſorry to find your *Lordſhip* of another Mind. † But I can never be able to conceive

* *Ser.* 1708. *p.* 7.

† *Anſw.* p. 12.

that

that a *Commiſſion* given to any Man merely for the doing good to *others*, ſhould make him ſo abſolutely unaccountable, that they might not *Feel* and *Cenſure* Him, as going to Ruine them; and *Puniſh* him as far as is neceſſary for *ſelf-Defenſe*, in thoſe *Caſes*, in which He who gave him this *Commiſſion* either is not able; as an *Earthly Governour* often is not; or hath never promiſed to interpoſe himſelf. Nor does this at all make the *Governours* the *Governed*; which is all that your *Lordſhip* advanceth againſt it: For this *Cenſuring*, and *Puniſhing*, are not *Acts* of *Civil Government*, but *Acts* neceſſary to, and inſeparable from, a *Right* to *ſelf-Defenſe*, and *ſelf-Preſervation*. Thus, therefore, I ſay. Suppoſing the *Commiſſion* to *Princes* came from *God* in ſuch manner that the words of it were written by his Finger, ſo as to be ſeen and read by all; and this *Commiſſion* were entirely limited to the *Good* of the *Society*: This would not take from the *Governed Society* a *Right* to *feel* when He was acting againſt that *Commiſſion*; or to *Cenſure*, and *Puniſh* Him, when He was attempting their Ruine, ſo far as ſhould be neceſſary for their own Preſervation. His being the *Miniſter of God for good* to them, conſider'd by it ſelf, would not do this: Nor would their exerciſing this *Right*, upon a moſt preſſing neceſſity, make them the *Governours* of their *Prince*, or ſuppoſe them *Commiſſioned* by *God Almighty* to be the *Civil Governours* of their *Civil Governour*: Which is the *Abſurdity* your *Lordſhip* would fix upon it. But, in this *Caſe*, the *Final*, *Judicial Cenſure*, and *Puniſhment*, would remain to *God Almighty*, from whom immediately the *Commiſſion* came; and yet there would remain to the *Society* a *Right* to ſuch *Cenſure*, and *Puniſhment*, as are inſeparable from a *Right* to *Self-Preſervation*. Thus, even upon this higheſt Suppoſition, *God* might, I hope, be acknowledged by me, *without a compliment*, as your *Lordſhip* expreſſeth it, the *only Ruler* of *Princes*, even whilſt I am contending for ſuch a *Right* in the *Ruled Society* to conſult their *Self-Preſervation*, as implies in it a ſort of *Cenſure*

and

and *Punishment*, and cannot be exercised without it.

2. My *Second Argument* is drawn from hence, that every Person who performs an office beneficial to us, is the *Minister of God to us for good:* And consequently that the *Magistrate*'s being call'd by St. *Paul* the *Minister* of *God*, is not, of it self, sufficient to prove Him unaccountable. For I must observe that this was your *Lordship*'s Argument. The *Supreme Civil Magistrate* is the *Minister* of *God*: And therefore *unaccountable*. The Point to be proved was that He is *unaccountable*. The *Medium* by which your *Lordship* appear'd to me to prove it, was his being the *Minister* of *God*, and called so by St. *Paul*. My *Answer* was, that this alone cannot be sufficient, because many others may very properly be called *Ministers* of *God* who yet are not *unaccountable*. To this now your *Lordship* replies, p. 13. that you considered the *Magistrate* as the *Highest Power upon Earth, and from St. Paul's affirming, that He, as such, is the Minister of God, or that He hath a Commission from God to exercise the highest Power, you still think the inference very just*. To this I beg leave to answer, That St. *Paul* doth not *affirm* that the *Highest Civil Magistrate*, considered as the *Highest*, is the *Minister* of *God*; but that the *Magistrate*, considered as the *Magistrate*, whether *Supreme* or *Subordinate*, is the *Minister* of *God*, as your *Lordship* in other places acknowledges. And that I did understand your *Argument* aright is plain from hence, that unless the force of it lies in his being the *Minister* of *God*, which was the Point your *Lordship* was then speaking to, and which is frequently mentioned in the management of it, his being the *Minister* of *God* can bear no part in it, so as to help to form the conclusion at all: As it is plain your *Lordship* design'd it should. The *Argument*, as now represented, is this, *Answer* p. 13. *For if*, saith your *Lordship*, *He holds the highest Power upon Earth by Commission from God; and to Question, Censure, and Punish, be Acts of Power, (as I truly take*

*take them to be ) then I think it does very plainly follow, That none but God can Queſtion and Puniſh Him: Becauſe there is none upon Earth that is or can be higher than the higheſt Power upon Earth.* Now, to ſhew your *Lordſhip* that, as you have now model'd this Argument, it receives no force at all from his being the *Miniſter* of *God*, or having his *Commiſſion* from *God*, which was the *point* then under your conſideration, and which even now your *Lordſhip* hath here inſerted; I only beg leave to ſuppoſe that his *Commiſſion* came from the *People*, and to obſerve that the inference here made, is as juſt upon that Suppoſition, as upon the other. *For if He holds the higheſt Power upon Earth, let it be by Commiſſion from the People, or how it will, and to Queſtion, Cenſure, and Puniſh, be Acts of Power, then I think it very plainly follows, That there is none upon earth to Queſtion, Cenſure, and Puniſh Him, becauſe there is none upon Earth that is or can be higher than the higheſt Power upon Earth.* This makes it evident that your *Lordſhip*'s preſent Argument doth indeed turn entirely upon His being the *Higheſt Power*, and upon the impoſſibility of there being any *higher Power* than the *Higheſt*; but that it is quite altered from what it was before. However, that I may not ſeem wholy to neglect your *Lordſhip*'s Argument, as now drawn up; I ſay again, upon the higheſt ſuppoſition poſſible, that, tho' the *Supreme Magiſtrate* be in *poſſeſſion* of the higheſt *Civil Authority*, and that by *Commiſſion* from *God*, in order to the *Temporal Happineſs* of the *Governed Society*; yet it doth not follow that He is therefore above all humane *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment*: becauſe *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment* are not always *Acts* of a *Superiour relation*, or of *Power* as it is uſed here for *Authority*; but *Acts*, in many Caſes, inſeparable from *Self-Defenſe* and *Self-Preſervation*; and becauſe this *Governour*'s having by Divine *Commiſſion* the *Higheſt Authority*, for the good of this *Society*, doth not take away from this *Society* the *Right* to defend it ſelf from *Ruine*, *Devaſtation*, and *Miſery*.

My

*My Third Argument* was drawn from *Eccleſiaſtical Miniſters* receiving their *Commiſſion* from *God*, to this effect, *As their being Commiſſioned by God doth not exempt them from Cenſure and Puniſhment in whatever they think fit to ſay, or do, under pretenſe of this Commiſſion; ſo likewiſe neither will the Supreme Magiſtrate's being Commiſſioned by God for the good of his Subjects prove any ſuch exemption for Him, in whatever He may do under pretenſe of that Commiſſion.* This plainly proceeds again, upon my underſtanding your *Lordſhip* to argue from his receiving his *Commiſſion* from *God*, to an *unlimited exemption* from all *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment*. Nor do you ſeem to deny the force of the *Argument* thus framed, which indeed was all I propoſed by it, To this I added my Obſervation upon your *Lordſhip*'s *Inſtance*, and urged it to this effect, That as a *Mayor*'s being Commiſſioned by the *King* for that *Office*, doth not exempt Him from ſuch *Cenſure* or *Puniſhment* from the *governed part* of the *Corporation* as in ſome Caſes is abſolutely neceſſary to *Self-preſervation*; ſo neither will the *Supreme Magiſtrate*'s being Commiſſioned by *God* for the *Office* of *Supreme Magiſtrate*, exempt Him in all *Caſes* from ſuch *Humane Cenſure*, or *Puniſhment*, as is implied in that *Right* to *Self-preſervation*, which the *Governed Society* ſtill enjoy. To all this your *Lordſhip* replies,

1. By charging me with *Manifeſt falſification* in arguing with your *Lordſhip* as if you had put the matter upon the *Magiſtrate*'s being *Commiſſioned by God*, or being the *Miniſter* of *God*, whereas you put it upon his being the *Supreme*, and *Higheſt Power*, and *did not ground it at all upon that Phraſe*, p. 20. Now, 1. Were this ſo; the moſt that could be made of this would be that I had been guilty of a *miſtake*, and a very innocent miſtake. 2. I do not deny that your *Lordſhip* mentions the *Supreme*, or *Higheſt* Power: But if your *Lordſhip* grounded your *Argument* only upon his being the *Supreme*; then you forſake St. *Paul* in this, who grounds *his* Concluſion for *Submiſſion* both to *Supreme* and *Subordinate*, upon the *Magiſtrate*'s being the *Miniſter* of *God* to us *for good*. St. *Paul* doth not argue from his being the *Higheſt* (for He is ſpeaking of all) but from his being the *Miniſter* of *God*. And therefore, it might have been pardonable in me to underſtand your *Lordſhip* ſo, as urging the *Apoſtle*'s Argument: Becauſe it was from Him, and from this very

expreſſion, that your *Lordſhip* undertook to ſpeak upon this Subject. 3. Either the Argument was founded upon the *Magiſtrate's* being the *Miniſter* of *God*, or it had not the leaſt relation to the *point* there propoſed by your *Lordſhip*, which was expreſly this, Not what was implied in his being the *Higheſt Civil Power*, but what was implied in this *Higheſt Civil Power's* being called the *Miniſter* of *God*, as any one may ſee, *Sermon*, p. 6. And if your *Lordſhip* did not mean to argue this point from his being *Commiſſioned* by *God*, but wholy from another conſideration, *viz.* his being the *Higheſt*, then this *Concluſion* would hardly have been brought in under that *Head*, in which you propoſe to ſpeak of the *Magiſtrate's Authority*, and *Commiſſion* coming from *God:* Nor would mention have been made of his being the *Miniſter* of *God*, and *Commiſſioned* by *Him*, all through the *Argument*, as I find it. For if it be *only* from his being the *Higheſt Power* that this is argued, the *Argument* ſeems entirely to turn upon the word *Higheſt*, which indeed is not uſed by St. *Paul:* And the Concluſion drawn from *hence*, as well as from the ſuppoſed abſurdity of making *Governours* the *Governed*, might be juſt the ſame, if the *Commiſſion* came only from the *People:* Which was a point your *Lordſhip* was manifeſtly oppoſing. 4. Your *Lordſhip*, in the Caſe of *Elective Monarchies*, particularly makes the obſervation, That tho' the *nomination* were from Men, yet the *Authority*, and *Commiſſion* were from *God*. And this being ſaid on purpoſe, leſt Men ſhould imagine that in *Elective Kingdoms* the *Electors* ſtill might retain a *Right* to Cenſure, and Puniſh *Miſmanagement*, cannot at all ſerve this *End*, unleſs your *Lordſhip* meant to argue againſt this from the *King's* receiving his *Commiſſion* from *God*, and not from the *Electors*. This again induced me ſo to underſtand your *Lordſhip:* Not thinking that your *Lordſhip* would make ſo expreſs mention in your *Argument* of his being Commiſſioned by *God*, without deſigning to lay the force of your Concluſion upon that. 5. Your *Lordſhip* before you come to the *inſtance*, by which you deſign to illuſtrate this matter, *Serm.* p. 8. propoſeth to ſhew that the *Sovereign Power upon Earth is ſubject only to God*, even in *Elective Kingdoms*, only by directing us to *Inſtances* of *the like nature, wherein the Officer hath his Nomination from one, and receives his Authority from another, and is accountable for the exerciſe of his Power only*

to

*to him from whom He received his Commiſſion.* 6. When your *Lordſhip* comes to a particular Inſtance, you plead a *Mayor*'s exemption from the *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment* of the *Corporation*, merely from his being the *Queen*'s *Miniſter*; and his being accountable only to Her merely from his *acting by her Commiſſion.* Now if this *Inſtance*, and the words before it, now quoted, were deſigned by your *Lordſhip* to illuſtrate this matter of the *Supreme Magiſtrate*'s being exempt from all *Cenſure*, and *Accountableneſs*; then your *Lordſhip* did argue for this *exemption*, from the *Magiſtrate*'s having his *Commiſſion* from *God.* But your *Lordſhip* did ſo deſign this *Inſtance*, and the preceding words. Therefore I leave it to any one to judge whether it was ſo much as a *miſtake* in me ſo to underſtand this Argument; and whether your *Lordſhip grounded this* Unaccountableneſs *only upon* his being the *Supreme Magiſtrate*, and *not at all* upon his being called by St. *Paul* the *Miniſter* of *God:* As you are here pleaſed to affirm to my great *ſurprize.*

Add to this that when your *Lordſhip* goes on to ſtrengthen what hath been before ſaid, you do it by proving, from the nature of the thing, that the *Authority* of the *Magiſtrate* muſt come from *God*, or that He muſt be *God*'s *Miniſter* in your ſenſe of the words, *p.* 9. The following *Inferences* likewiſe are drawn from his being the *Miniſter* of *God:* Amongſt which is the *Inference* relating to *Non-reſiſtance.* From whence it again appears that this was the principal point in your *Lordſhip*'s thoughts, and the main *ſupport* of your *Argument.*

2. Your *Lordſhip* not only makes me guilty of *falſifying* this *Argument*, but likewiſe all the way inſinuates that you were ſpeaking throughout this *Argument* only of a *Judicial Cenſuring*, and *Puniſhing*; or a *Sitting* in *Judgment* upon the *Chief Magiſtrate.* To this I have ſufficiently anſwered under the *Second Head* of this *Reply.* And now having anſwered to theſe two *Charges*, I crave leave to obſerve, that, your *Lordſhip* having not been pleaſed to allege any thing to the contrary, my *Arguments* ſtand good by which I endeavoured to prove, that the *Supreme Magiſtrate*'s being the *Miniſter* of *God*, or immediately Commiſſioned by Him, will not, conſidered by it ſelf, prove that He is exempt, in ſome poſſible Caſes, from that *Cenſure*, and *Puniſhment*, which

is neceſſarily implied in that *Self-preſervation*, and *Self-defenſe* which the *Governed Society* have a Right to regard. And I deſire it may be remembred, that, as in the *Caſe* of the *Mayor* of a *Corporation*, the final, Judicial Acquittance, or Condemnation of him for his behaviour during his *Office*, belongs to the *King*, or *Queen*, and their *Courts*; but ſtill the *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment* implied in *Self-Defenſe* remains in the *Corporation*, in thoſe Inſtances in which immediate *Ruine*, without their interpoſition, is evident: So likewiſe, in the *Caſe* of a *Civil Governour* ſuppoſed to have his *Commiſſion* from *God* himſelf, the final, Judicial Acquittance, or Condemnation of him for all his Behaviour, under the pretenſe of this *Commiſſion*, may belong to *Almighty God*; but, notwithſtanding this, the *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment*, inſeparable from *Reſiſtance*, may, in ſome *Caſes*, remain to the *Governed Society*, by virtue of that *Right* to *Self-preſervation*, which *God Almighty* doth by no means take away, when He gives a *Commiſſion* to a *Governour* on purpoſe to *preſerve*, and *defend* them.

I did likewiſe, under the ſame head, argue from the *Supreme Magiſtrate*'s not acting with *God*'s *Authority* properly ſo called, any farther than He Acts agreeably to *God*'s *Commiſſion*; and from his having no *Superiority* in thoſe inſtances, in which He Acts *without*, or *againſt*, his Commiſſion. This *your Lordſhip* ſeems to allow, p. 15. but adds, that all that follows from hence is *that his Subjects are not bound to Obey him in thoſe inſtances* (*which is what*, you ſay, *you have more than once granted in that Sermon*;) *but it doth not therefore follow that He thereby ſo ceaſeth to be a Magiſtrate, as that henceforward his Subjects are not bound to obey him in any thing. God forbid* it ſhould! I am ſure I never ſaid or thought any thing like it. Nay, I have gone farther than your *Lordſhip* doth in this place. For here you infer, that his *Subjects are not oblig'd to obey him in thoſe inſtances*, in which He is without *Authority* properly ſo call'd. Whereas, if they be ſuch inſtances as are of an indifferent nature, tho' not belonging to his Office; if they be ſuch as are prejudicial to Private Men only; nay, or to the intereſt of the Public, ſo it be not in a very great degree: In theſe inſtances, even I, who am repreſented as an Enemy to *Magiſtracy*, preſs the continuance of *Obedience*, from the conſideration of *Public Good*, and the general uſefulneſs of the *Governing*

verning *Office*, according to St. *Paul*'s Argument. This ſame *Public Good* indeed, is the ſtrongeſt Argument againſt *Submiſſion*, when *Univerſal Ruine* is threatned. But all that I intended was to take away that reproach from *Religion*, of giving *God*'s *Authority* to the *Miſtakes*, or *Tyranny* of *Governours*, and to fix our active *Obedience*, as far as it is conſiſtent with the *Public Good*, upon its true foundation. Beſides, your *Lordſhip* having argued for an *Unlimited Exemption* from *Puniſhment* by *Reſiſtance*, from *Magiſtrates* being *Supreme* by their *Commiſſion*; nothing could be more natural, or more proper than to obſerve that this *Argument* could prove an exemption from that *Reſiſtance* in no *inſtances* but thoſe in which they had this *Supremacy*, and conſequently not a *total*, *unlimited Exemption*; that this *Supremacy* vaniſheth, when it becomes inconſiſtent with the *Preſervation*, and *Defenſe* of the *Governed Society*, which hath then a *Right* to that ſort of *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment* which is implied in the *Right* of *Self-Preſervation*. Of which, I ſee not that your *Lordſhip* hath taken any notice, but rather hath choſen to argue upon other Points, in which I am not at all concerned.

4. Another *Objection* which I brought againſt your *Lordſhip*'s reaſoning was taken from St. *Paul*'s calling the *Inferiour*, as well as *Supreme Magiſtrate*, the *Miniſter* of *God*. This your *Lordſhip* allows. From whence I argue, That the being the *Miniſter* of *God*, conſider'd by it ſelf, will no more prove the *Supreme*, than the *Inferior*, abſolutely exempt. And by what *Argument* is it that your *Lordſhip* will prove that St. *Paul* did not mean *this* to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe of both, which He uſeth of both without the leaſt diſtinction? But you ſay that every one, except my ſelf, might have ſeen, you were ſpeaking of the *Supreme Magiſtrate*. I am ſure, I always ſo underſtood it: But your *Lordſhip*'s Argument taking it's riſe from St. *Paul*'s calling the *Magiſtrate* the *Miniſter* of *God*; what more proper than to obſerve that, this expreſſion being us'd of *Subordinate* as well as *Supreme*, without any diſtinction, nothing can be inferr'd merely from hence in favour of the *Supreme*, which may not likewiſe be inferr'd in favour of the *Subordinate*. This is all I ever intended by this *Obſervation*, and not to repreſent St. *Paul* as *excepting* the *Supreme Magiſtrate*, *and not ſo much as thinking of the Roman Emperour*: Which yet any one would imagine I had done, who reads the 27 p. of your

your *Lordſhip*'s *Anſwer*. What I have ſaid therefore, on this head, I now make bold to ſay again, that, tho' *Public Good* may furniſh us with many Arguments to prove a greater *exemption* in the *Supreme*, than in the *Subordinate Magiſtrates:* Yet St. *Paul* having ſpoken of all together in one breath; the *Higher* or *Eminent Powers*; (the ſame with all in *Authority*, or *Eminence*, in another place) the *Ordinance* of *God*, the *Miniſter* of *God*, being ſaid of the *Loweſt Degree* of *Magiſtrates* as well as of the *Higheſt*; no *Unaccountableneſs*, no *Submiſſion*, no degree of *Non reſiſtance* can be inferred merely from the expreſſions here uſed, with reſpect to the *Higheſt*, which may not with equal force be inferred from them, with reſpect to the *Lower* and *Subordinate*. For He is not here conſidering them under the notion of *Higheſt*, and *Loweſt*; but as all together managing a moſt Godlike, and Beneficent Office in the World.

5. With reſpect to what I urged in the *fifth place*, that the *Right* of *Self-Defenſe* was the thing mainly contended for by *others*, and not at all, under that expreſs notion, *touched* upon by your *Lordſhip*; I have already given a full and ſufficient Demonſtration, that, under the colour of ſuch words, as *Unaccountable*, *Exempt* from *Cenſure*, and *Puniſhment*, and the like, applied to *Governours*, your *Lordſhip* meant effectually to deveſt the *Governed* from all *Right* to *Real Self-Defenſe*. And I now obſerve that your *Lordſhip* doth not here ſo much as attempt to ſhew that your *Arguments*, tho' deſigned for that purpoſe, are of ſtrength enough to prove the *Civil Magiſtrate* exempt from ſuch *Humane Cenſure*, and *Puniſhment* as is inſeparable from this *Right* to *Self-Defenſe*. From whence it appears both that my *Fifth* reaſon was very much to the purpoſe; and that it ſtill remains in its full force. Thus much in *vindication* of what I before offered againſt your *Lordſhip*'s Argument for the *Unlimited Exemption* of the *Civil Magiſtrate*, founded, as I thought, and as I ſtill think, upon his being the *Miniſter* of *God*.

*Secondly*, I now beg leave to conſider again what I preſumed to offer againſt your *Lordſhip*'s judgment concerning the *Original* of *Civil Government*.

1. My firſt Argument was to this effect, If a man have ſuch Power over his own Life, as that He may lawfully contract, and by that contract be obliged, when the

*Public*

*Public Good* requires it, to give it up; then the *Authority* of *Civil Governours* may come from this *contract*. I inſtanced in a *Soldier*, who by his *contract* is oblig'd to venture, where He is ſure to loſe his Life, at his *General's* Command. Permit me here juſt to obſerve that the word *Venture*, by the Power of Cuſtom, is not only uſed *where there is an hazard and uncertainty*, but alſo ſignifies ſimply to *Dare*, as may be ſeen in our *Dictionaries:* Which is hardly worth the mentioning, but that your *Lordſhip* thought it worth your Cenſure. But to the *Argument* your *Lordſhip* anſwers, that a *Soldier* is not *ſure* of Death *in the Field of Battel.* Nor did I ſay, he was; But in ſome other *Caſes* He may: Which I am ſure may be well ſuppoſed, if they have not really in fact happened. Nay, in the very Field of Battel, He is oblig'd to perſiſt in his oppoſition to the Enemy, and not to give back ſo as to endanger the Victory, even at that time when He ſees, and feels Death to be inevitable; as inevitable as if an *Executioner* was to give the ſtroke. Nor doth your *Lordſhip* ſeem to me, in another place, much to doubt of this *Right.* For when I proſecute the ſame *Argument* by ſaying that a Man, in ſome Caſes, may run voluntarily upon inevitable Death, for the ſafety of his Neighbours, *&c.* Your *Lordſhip* grants this, but ſaith that this reſults, *not from his having a power over his own Life, but from God's having ſomewhere ſaid, antecedently to any* Original Contract *made at* Horeb, *that we ought to lay down our Lives for the Brethren.* Now, if your *Lordſhip* means that this reſults from an *immediate Revelation* made of his Will in this particular, this was not made a part of *Revelation*, as I know of, till many Hundreds of years after *God's* taking upon himſelf the *Government* of the *Jews* at *Horeb: viz.* 1 *John.* 3, 16. But if your *Lordſhip* means that this was a dictate of *Reaſon* and true *Honour*, which is the voice of *God*; (as I ſuppoſe, you muſt mean) this is all I contend for; that Men, by that *Reaſon* which God hath endowed them with, are taught that they have this Power over their own lives, delegated to them by their *Supreme Lord*, when He made them reaſonable and ſociable Creatures. So that in Men, endowed with *Reaſon* by *God* their Maker, there is this *Power*, and it is a true *judgment* of their *Reaſon*, that they may lawfully make uſe of it. But after having in other words granted what I contended for, your *Lordſhip* ſaith that this doth not

come

come up to the point, which was that the *Magiſtrate* hath a Power to put a *Murtherer* to Death, which the *Murtherer* at that time hath not over himſelf. But to this I anſwer, that tho' a *Condemned Murtherer* may not have this Power over his own Life, yet this very Man might have ſo much Power over it as to contract at firſt with the *Magiſtrate*, that when the *Public Good* required it his Life ſhould be given up: Which alone is ſufficient to the Point I was upon, *viz.* That the *Authority* of the *Magiſtrate* to take away the Life of this *Murtherer*, when *Public Good* ſhould require it, might be founded upon a *Contract* in which this very Man bore a part. But your *Lordſhip* infers from hence that the *Magiſtrate hath more Power over this Man's Life, than he himſelf hath, or would have had in my imaginary ſtate of Nature: Which* conſequently *cannot come from this Man*, p. 24. I obſerve, therefore,

2. That, after I had declared that the point did not depend upon Men's having Power over their own Lives, if ſo be they appear to have *Originally* a Power, in ſome particular inſtances, over the lives of *others*; I argued in the next place, that tho' the *Magiſtrate* may have more Power over this *Murtherer*'s Life than *He* himſelf hath, or ever had; yet He hath not more Power over it than the reſt of the *Society* have *originally* in themſelves. For inſtance, Let *Cain* be the *Murtherer:* And this at a time when all *Mankind* were within the compaſs of no very extenſive *Neighbourhood.* I ſay, every one of theſe had ſuch a Power over the *Life* of *Cain*, that, in cold Bloud, whenever they met him, they might uſe him as a *Common Enemy*, as one who would upon a like occaſion Murther any of them, as He had his Brother *Abel:* And that whoever had ſo uſed him, (I ſpeak, without ſuppoſing Almighty God to have interpoſed) would have been a *Public Benefactor.* In which *Sentence*, that I may not ſeem to neglect your *Lordſhip*'s *Queſtions*, I underſtand by a *Common Enemy*, one who not only hath been guilty of a *Crime* which nearly toucheth *Humane Society*; but one of whom they can have no ſecurity againſt the like to come; and likewiſe one, whoſe Puniſhment is neceſſary for the common Safety, and for the *terror* of any like minded. And by a *Benefactor* I underſtand, not *one who doth a thing Beneficial in the Event, but, one that doth a Beneficial thing by lawful means, and in a lawful*

*a lawful and warrantable manner.* Such an one do I maintain that Perſon to be, who kills this *Murtherer:* And a *Benefactor*, in this ſame ſenſe, pardon me this one Inſtance of my Zeal, do I account our *Late Deliverer* to have been; *not to be Regiſter'd*, by me, *in the Liſt with* Judas *and* Pilate, amongſt thoſe who do things *Beneficial* in the *Event* by unlawful means; but in that Noble *Liſt* of ſuch as have *ſacrificed* all their *Temporal Eaſe*, and *Quiet*, to ſave whole Nations *by lawful means, and in a lawful and warrantable manner.* Your *Lordſhip* will eaſily ſee the *Reaſon* why I here ſpeak this: And I wiſh I could hide it from every other *Reader.* But, now to return, your *Lordſhip* would ask this Man whom I call a *Public Benefactor* to *ſhew his Warrant* for taking away the Life of this *Murtherer*, *as*, in the like Caſe, *the Magiſtrate can do his, being declared in Scripture to be a Revenger to execute wrath.* If your *Lordſhip* here means a *Scripture-warrant*, or a *Warrant* by expreſs Revelation, as one would think by theſe words, I anſwer that Thouſands of years had paſſed before this *Scripture-warrant* was penn'd; that the *Heathen Magiſtrates*, in all parts of the World, had no ſuch Warrant to ſhew, neither have at this day; that during all that time, and ſince, in the unenlighten'd parts of the World, any *Magiſtrate* might as well have been asked for his *warrant.* For even ſuppoſing that He had, in your *Lordſhip*'s ſenſe, a *warrant* from *God*; yet He could not know whither to have recourſe for it: And perhaps would have appealed only to the power lodged in *Him* by the *Community.* If your *Lordſhip* means a *warrant* from the light of Reaſon, and the nature of the thing; as no other can be, in this Inſtance, expected; I think there is ſufficient *Warrant*, and ſufficient *Evidence* of it. Nor doth your *Lordſhip* attempt to ſay any thing againſt this *Argument*, but that ſome of his *Neighbours* may perhaps take him for as great a *Malefactor* as the *Murtherer* himſelf. To which I reply, that if they ſhould, they would ſhew themſelves *Enemies* to *Mankind*, and of a very bad Spirit: And their Crime would be like the Crime of thoſe Men, who being without Revelation, and ignorant of *God*'s expreſs approbation of the *Magiſtrate*'s *Office* made known in it, ſhould riſe up againſt the *Magiſtrate* as a *Malefactor*, for having put to Death a Man guilty of *Murther.*

What I ſaid, under this Head, your *Lordſhip* avoids, becauſe, you ſay, I found it upon a *Right* of *Self preſervation*, which is not *at all to the point you are diſcourſing of in your Sermon*. With ſubmiſſion, my *Lord*, the *point* You were arguing againſt, and which I was here treating of, was the *Humane Original* of *Civil Government*. And if it be implied in the *Right* of *Self-preſervation*, that a *Neighbourhood* of Men, before a *Magiſtrate* is fixed amongſt them, have ſuch a *Right* over a *Company* of *Robbers*, as the *Magiſtrate* himſelf hath after *He* is fixed, which is the Inſtance I give, *p.* 20; then this ought to be conſidered, becauſe it is an *Argument* againſt what your *Lordſhip* expreſsly, and in words, aſſerted. For ſuppoſing that you might avoid what I ſaid in the *firſt part* of the *Conſiderations*, about *Self-defenſe*, as a thing not *touched upon* by your *Lordſhip*; yet the *Caſe* is very different here, where you expreſsly aſſert that there is not, originally, either in ſingle Men, or in a *Community* of *Men*, that right to puniſh *Evil-doers* which is in the *Magiſtrate*. Againſt this I argue from this *Inſtance* of a *Band* of *Deſtroyers* coming down upon a place where there is not a *Civil Magiſtrate* ſettled; the Inhabitants of which place have a *Right* to go out againſt theſe; to do what they can to kill them; or, if they take any of them, to put them to death, even in cool blood, for a terror to the reſt: Which is all that a *General*, or *Magiſtrate*, can do, when He is eſtabliſhed amongſt them. This is not fixing any thing upon your *Lordſhip* which you have not ſpoken of; but arguing directly againſt your *aſſertion*: And therefore either the *force* of it is to be acknowledged, or the *weakneſs* of it to be ſhew'n.

Another obſervation of your *Lordſhip*'s againſt this *Poſition*, that the *Power* of the *Magiſtrate* comes from Men, is, that it is directly contrary to what the *Apoſtle* affirms, viz. *That there is no Power but of God*. In anſwering to this, I did ſuppoſe that your *Lordſhip* here meant that it was contrary to the *true meaning* of theſe *words*, or to theſe words rightly underſtood, and not merely to the *words*, without any determinate meaning affixed to them. But your *Lordſhip* ſeems to take it amiſs, and you ask, *Where have I interpreted thoſe words of the Apoſtle?* To which give me leave to anſwer, that you could not affirm the *Poſition* before mentioned to be *contrary* to the *Apoſtle*'s Affirmation, without putting a ſenſe upon the *words*

con-

contrary to that *Position:* And this is *interpreting* the words. As when a *Roman Catholic* ſaith that the *Proteſtant Doctrine* about the *Sacrament* is *directly contrary* to what our *Saviour* affirms, *This is my Body*; He puts an *interpretation*, or a *ſenſe* upon theſe words, contrary to the *Proteſtant Doctrine*. And had I not underſtood your *Lordſhip* thus, ſurely I might well be taxed with little reſpect to *you*, to ſuppoſe that you only meant to obſerve, that that *Poſition* is contrary to the *ſound* of St. *Paul*'s words, which your *Lordſhip* muſt have meant, unleſs you put an interpretation upon them; but which ſignifies nothing to the *Cauſe* in hand. Yet is your *Lordſhip* here endeavouring, *p.* 28. to make the *Reader* believe that it was only the *words* of St. *Paul*, without any interpretation, that you had your Eye to. For you ſay, *I only barely cite the words, I only ſimply affirm that that poſition is directly contrary to them. And*, after this, *that the Reader may the better judge, you preſent the matter in this view.*

| Rom. 13. 1. | The Poſition. |
| --- | --- |
| *There is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.* | *The Sovereign Power of the Supreme Magiſtrate is derived to Him from the aggregate Body of the People, as by their Grant, or Conceſſion.* |

Now here one of theſe two things muſt be true; Either that your *Lordſhip* interprets theſe words ſo as that by *Power*, and *Powers*, ſhall be underſtood *Magiſtratical Authority*; and by being *ordained of God* ſhall be underſtood, coming by *Commiſſion* from *Him*, and not from *Men* who have no ſuch *Authority* to give; and then indeed the *Poſition* contradicts what you underſtand to be affirmed by St. *Paul:* Or, that you allege the *words* only without any determinate ſenſe to them.

If the *former* of theſe be true; then I am not to be blamed for ſuppoſing that your *Lordſhip* put a *ſenſe* upon theſe words: And then the only point had been, not to have produced the words, but to have proved *that* to have been the only true *interpretation*. For till that be done, any one who thinks the *Perſons* of *Governours* to be here ſpoken of, as many Learned Men do; and will but interpret, *ordained of God*, as highly with reſpect to *them*, as your *Lordſhip* doth in your way; may ſhew the ſame con-

tradiction between your *Lordſhip's Poſition*, and theſe *words*, by repreſenting it after the ſame manner.

| Rom. 13. 1. | Your *Lordſhip's* Poſition. |
|---|---|
| *There is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.* | *Governours are not ordained of God, but are entirely depending upon the Laws and Conſtitutions of ſeveral Countries*, i. e. *the Will of Men.* |

If the *latter* be true, that your *Lordſhip* meant only that in *ſound* theſe words contradict the *forementioned poſition*; I anſwer that there is no ſuch thing as contradicting the *ſound* of *words*, without any particular meaning put upon them: A *contradiction* being nothing, but with reſpect to particular *poſitions*, with ſuch and ſuch determinate meanings affixed to the words of them. If this be not ſo; ſome of the trueſt *Poſitions* in the World may be ſaid to contradict ſome *Text* of *Scripture* or other. For inſtance, The *Poſition* of *Proteſtants* is, That the *Sacramental Bread* is not the *Body* of *Chriſt*, as the *Papiſts* underſtand it: This, ſaith a *Papiſt*, is *directly contrary to what our Lord affirms.* For this purpoſe *He may only cite the words*, and *only ſimply affirm* that it is ſo, and *preſent the matter in this view.*

| Matth. 26. 26. | The Poſition. |
|---|---|
| *This is my Body.* | *This is not the Body of Chriſt, but Bread.* |

And he may add your *Lordſhip's* words that follow here. *If the Reader doth not ſee a contradiction between theſe two Aſſertions, I can't help his Eyeſight, nor his Underſtanding. I make no gloſs at all upon the Text. I give no ſtudied and elaborate interpretation of it. That belongs to thoſe to do who would have it thought that there is not a contradiction between that Text and this Poſition.*

The like Methods may be taken in the following Inſtances.

| Texts of Scripture. | Poſitions. |
|---|---|
| *Swear not at all.* | *It is Lawful to Swear upon ſome occaſions.* |
| *Children obey your Parents in all things.* | *Children obey not your Parents in all things.* |
| *I ſay unto you, Reſiſt not evil.* | *It is Lawful to reſiſt evil, in ſome Caſes.* |

But

But now, if the *Positions* were a little otherwise expressed, the *Contradiction* would not appear to be any real *Contradiction*. As for instance,

| Matth. 26. 26. | Position. |
|---|---|
| *This is my Body.* | *This is Bread; called the Body of Christ not in a literal, but figurative sense.* |

So, with respect to the *Position* opposed by your *Lordship*.

| Rom. 13. 1. | The Position. |
|---|---|
| *There is no Power but of God: The Powers that be are ordained of God.* | *The Authority of Civil Governours came originally from Agreement of Men: Said here to be ordained of God, as it is agreeable to his Will that Civil Governours should have this Authority.* |

For all the contradiction between this *Position*, and St. *Paul*'s Affirmation is this, that they who maintain this *Position* understand St. *Paul*'s words, *being ordain'd of God*, in a *Sense* consistent with that *Position*, and a sense justifiable by other places of *Scripture*. And *He* doth not really *contradict* a *Text* of *Scripture*, who allows it in that *Sense*, which alone seems to *Him* consistent with the nature of things; and which can be defended by the common usage of words. But I have said enough to this Point, and I fear too much. But in saying thus much I have likewise given an account, that this expression may be used both of the *Persons* and *Authority* of *Governours*; as your *Lordship* saith it must have reference to the *Roman Emperours*: of their *Persons*, without implying in it either that *God* expressly nominated them; or so much as always approved of the *methods* in which they came to the *Government*; and of their *Authority*, without implying that it did not come *immediately* from Mankind, whom *God* himself made *Reasonable* and *Sociable* Creatures. Which sufficiently excuseth me from what your *Lordship* seems to expect of me, p. 30. because I never denied that the *Apostle* did here affirm the *Magistrate*'s *Authority* to be *ordain'd* of *God*; but only desired the liberty to understand that expression after a manner different from your *Sense* of it, and as justifiable by all *Rules* of *Interpretation*. And since your *Lordship* would not understand this of the *Persons* of those in *possession* of *Power*; any otherwise than as they come

come to that *poſſeſſion* under the inſpection of *God*'s Providence: I thought I might be allowed a like latitude in interpreting it with reſpect to the *Authority*, properly ſo called, of *Perſons* in *Power*. I only add, that I am ſtill of the ſame Mind, that if the *Authority* of the firſt *Roman Emperours*; of *Him*, for inſtance, under whom our *Saviour* was born; or of *Him*, under whom he Suffered; or of *Him* under whom St. *Paul* wrote this, muſt be underſtood to be conveyed immediately from *God*, in the higheſt Senſe; then I ſee not but that *mere Force* may convey a *Right*, and demand a *Divine Commiſſion* properly ſo called. For what *preſcription*, which the *Republic* had ſo long on its ſide; or what *Authoritative Legal Act* of the whole *Conſtitution*, the firſt *Emperours* had on their ſide, (which your *Lordſhip* ſaith ought to be looked on as the *beſt Titles*;) it will be hard to determine: Or indeed what better Title than that of *Mere Poſſeſſion*.

I can think of nothing alleged by your *Lordſhip* in Relation to the *Divine Commiſſion* of *Princes* which I have not conſidered, unleſs it be your profeſſing to argue from that expreſſion, *Prov.* 8. 15. *By me Kings Reign*, the very next words to which are theſe, *And Princes decree juſtice*. Now, 1. *Solomon* is not here ſpeaking of *God*, but of *Wiſdom*, called *Underſtanding*, v. 14. of *Wiſdom poſſeſſed by God*, v. 22. and by which he Acts. Nor can this be poſſibly underſtood of any but *Wiſe Kings*, becauſe no others Reign by *Wiſdom*; or of any but ſuch as *decree juſtice*, as the very words of the ſame verſe limit it. 2. Suppoſing this ſpoken of *God*; your *Lordſhip* cannot think that this expreſſion neceſſarily implies in it a *Divine Commiſſion*, in the Senſe now debated, given to all *Kings*; becauſe you have obſerved your *ſelf*, *Sermon*, p. 5. that by ſuch expreſſions in *Scripture*, as God *putteth down one, and ſetteth up another*; *He giveth the Kingdom to whom He pleaſeth*; *He gave the land of Judea into the hands of Nebuchadnezzer*, nothing more is often meant, than that He permitted theſe things to come to paſs: And becauſe every one, who reads the *Scripture*, knows that what comes to paſs under his inſpection, is often there ſpoken of as *His doing*, even when it cannot be ſo much as, in the leaſt degree, approved of by Him. 3. If your *Lordſhip* will not interpret this expreſſion of *God*'s nominating the very Perſons; why muſt it be meant of his *immediate Commiſſion* to lawful *Poſſeſſors*? The *Phraſe* is as ſtrong for the

*firſt*.

*first.* It excludes no *Poſſeſſors.* Neither will it any more follow from this expreſſion, which alone we are now conſidering, that God interpoſeth in giving a *Commiſſion* to any *King* in our days; than that He immediately interpoſeth in nominating him for *King.*

Your *Lordſhip*'s *Third Argument* was founded upon this, that there was not a number of Men *before* the *Inſtitution* of *Civil Government*, which *number* of Men had the Power of the *Magiſtrate*, &c. My firſt *Reply* to this, was not *carping* at an expreſſion, which I have ever avoided, but an *Argument* drawn from what your *Lordſhip* had maintained before, which ſeem'd to me inconſiſtent with the allowance you made here, *Sermon*, p. 11. where you ſay, *This indeed might poſſibly have been true in caſe this multitude had ſprung out of the Earth, or been created all at once*, &c. Now if any one deſires to be ſatisfied what your *Lordſhip* there meant, that *This* ſhould refer to, theſe two obſervations are enough, 1. That the words immediately preceding this *allowance* are theſe, *Which whole multitude had then by Natural Right, the ſame Power over ſingle Men, which is now exerciſed by the Magiſtrate.* Then follows, *This indeed might poſſibly be true*, &c. which no one I believe could help interpreting of this, *that this multitude might have a Magiſtratical Authority in them.* 2. That had your *Lordſhip* had an Eye only to this, *viz.* That there was a Number of Men before the inſtitution of *Civil Government*; you could not have choſen this expreſſion. For ſuppoſing that *Multitude created all at once*, it not only *might poſſibly*, but *muſt certainly be true*, that there was a *Number* of Men before the *Inſtitution* of *Civil Government*: From whence it is plain that your *Lordſhip*'s conceſſion had an Eye to the other Point immediately preceding it. So that my *Argument* drawn from this *Conceſſion* naturally offered it ſelf, and ſtill ſtands good: It being impoſſible to ſuppoſe but that your *Lordſhip* would at firſt have ſaid ſo, had you deſign'd it for a *Conceſſion*, merely for diſputation ſake, and not for a *real* allowance.

My *Second* reply was taken from your *Lordſhip*'s diſtinguiſhing between the *Natural*, and *Political* Capacity of Mankind. The force of the reply is not denied by your *Lordſhip* any otherwiſe than by ſaying that I miſtook your Senſe, and by maintaining, that tho' there be ground for the diſtinction, as the World goes now, yet at firſt the *Paternal Government*, at leaſt of *Adam* and *Noah*, implied

plied in it a *Civil Government* over all their *Deſcendents*. That your *Lordſhip* may be of this Mind, I do not deny: But that you ſpake in your *firſt Acceſſion-Sermon* of a *Natural Right* to *Civil Government* in ſo extenſive a manner as to oblige your *Readers* to think otherwiſe, is I think very plain from what I have before ſaid. And that, in this very *paſſage* of the *laſt Sermon*, about which we now are ſpeaking, you could not be underſtood by any to make the *Natural* and *Political Capacity*, even of *Adam*'s Children the ſame, is evident from hence, that you are ſpeaking of *every Man ſince the firſt*, i. e. *of his Children*, as well as thoſe of this Generation; and do affirm of *them*, that in their *Natural Capacity* they were *born Subject to their Parents, and in their Political Capacity to the King*. The uſing the word *and*, here, and not *or*; joined with your *Lordſhip*'s unlimited declaration againſt *Natural Right* to *Civil Government*, will juſtify me in fixing this upon you. But to be ſure, now your *Lordſhip* hath ſo plainly declared your ſelf, in this *Anſwer*, for *Adam*, and *Noah*'s *Civil Authority*; And in your *Sermon* for the *Paternal Title* of the *Firſt Kings* to *Civil Government*, which muſt take in more than *Adam*, and *Noah*; I ſhall not any more charge *you* with ſuch a *diſtinction* in ſo unlimited a manner. And your *Lordſhip* having enter'd, as I think, into a new *Scheme*; and a *Scheme*, I believe, unknown in former Ages; I ſhall not now trouble you with my endeavours to confute it: But beg leave here to promiſe, ſince your *Lordſhip* hath given credit at leaſt to ſome branch or branches of the *Patriarchal Scheme*, that a *Diſtinct Examination* of every *Branch* of that *Scheme*, as it hath been mended, and laboured, by the lateſt, and ableſt Hand that ever yet managed it, which hath lain by me for ſome time, ſhall be Publiſhed in a *Second Part* of the *Meaſures of Submiſſion*, which will ſoon follow theſe Papers; and in which the *Original* of *Civil Authority* ſhall be largely diſcuſſed. At preſent, ſince your *Lordſhip* here ſaith, that if *Moſes*'s *Hiſtory of the Creation be true, the Magiſtrate's Power is ſuch as the People never could have*, p. 32. and that *you verily believe the firſt Man had as much the Power*, (i. e. in this Queſtion, the *Authority*) *of a Civil Governour, as any King hath now*, p. 33. I only beg leave to ask, How this appears? And I find, that your *Lordſhip*, p. 33. acknowledges that it is not *ſo eaſy to prove this in the Antediluvian State*, becauſe of the ſhortneſs of the *Hiſtory*.

But,

But, with reſpect to the Times after the Flood your *Lordſhip* thinks it evident that *that Command*, Whoſo ſheddeth Man's Blood, by Man ſhall his Blood be ſhed, *either inſtituted a Civil Government, or ſuppoſed it already ſettled: For who but the Civil Magiſtrate could Judicially put to Death a Murtherer? And who could be then that Civil Governour but Noah?* But, with Submiſſion, *My Lord*, If this *Command inſtituted Civil Government*, as you allow us to think it might; then *Noah* was not *Civil Governour* before this, neither in the *Ark*, nor after the Flood; then his being a *Magiſtrate* did not depend upon his being the *Common Father*, but upon *God*'s poſitive declaration; and then it is eaſie to anſwer your *Lordſhip*'s laſt *Queſtion*, by ſaying that any one might have been that *Civil Governour* as well as *Noah*, by the appointment of *God*, who hath the abſolute diſpoſal of this *Right* to *Government*. But if your *Lordſhip* will relinquiſh this; and ſay, that this *Command* ſuppoſeth a *Civil Government* already fixed in *Noah*, I beg of you to conſider whether this be not ſuppoſing the very thing in debate: Becauſe there is nothing in theſe words that neceſſarily infers a *Judicial procedure* againſt a *Murtherer*, after the Cuſtom of ſuch *Courts* of Judicature as long experience ſeems to have brought into uſe; and nothing but what may be interpreted as an allowance to all Men to attaque, and uſe a *Murtherer* as a public *Enemy*. And if this may be the meaning of them, then it muſt be proved that there were *Judicial Proceedings* againſt *Malefactors*, at that time, in uſe, from other paſſages, and not from *this*, which doth by no means neceſſarily imply any ſuch thing. And I cannot but think, if *Almighty God* had reſpect in this *paſſage* to *Noah*, as a *Civil Magiſtrate* already ſettled, that it would have been expreſſed ſo as to have named *Him*, as the only *Avenger of Blood*; and *ſo* likewiſe, if *Modern Accounts* of *Magiſtracy* be true, as to have exempted *Him* from all *Cenſure*, and *Puniſhment* from the reſt of Mankind. Neither of which is done in theſe words. *Whoſo ſheddeth Man's Blood* is as unlimited an expreſſion as poſſible, and as little in favour of *Noah*, as of any of his Sons: Spoken to all in common, *Gen.* 9. 6. And in the threatning, *by man ſhall his blood be ſhed*, the word *Man* may ſignify any Man, of what degree ſoever, as well as the word *Man* in the former part of the Sentence, *whoſo ſhed-*

*deth man's blood.* Which is enough to ſhew that what your *Lordſhip* hath alleged in favour even of *Adam* and *Noah*, is not ſufficient to prove that their *Paternal Government* implied in it a *Civil Government* over their *Deſcendents*; much leſs, to prove that this was of any importance to the *Civil Government* of any Nation in the World, even the next minute after their deaths.

I have but one thing now to add, which I confeſs I cannot perſuade my ſelf to omit, it ſeems to be of ſo great importance to this Nation in its preſent circumſtances: *viz.* that, if *Paternal Right* were by *God*'s appointment, the foundation of *Civil Authority*; then, either *God*'s appointment is of little obligation, or it is impoſſible that any *Preſcription*, or any *Humane Conſtitution*, can give to a *Woman* a *Right* to *Civil Government*. For tho', *after the innumerable Changes that have been made in the Governments of all Nations*, it cannot appear which *Man* hath the antient *Natural Right* to the *Civil Government* of a *Nation*; yet this muſt appear, that it is impoſſible a *Woman* ſhould have it: *Non apparere* may be, in effect, the ſame with *non eſſe* in ſome *Caſes*. But what ſhall we ſay to the *Caſe* of a *Queen*, of whom, upon the foregoing Principles, I ſuſpect, it may be affirmed, not only that her *Original Right* to *Government* doth not appear; but that it *appears* plainly, *She* can have *none?* I fear this will reduce the *Title* of any *Queen* to nothing better than *Uſurpation:* And this conſideration hath made me, on other occaſions, appear againſt ſuch a *Scheme*, and think it worth while to examine it.

3. My *Third Reply* was taken from hence, That your *Lordſhip* had not urged any thing to prove that every Man, ſince the firſt, was born a Subject, in a *Political* ſenſe, which was the Point to be proved. This was the *medium* which your *Lordſhip* voluntarily choſe, in order to prove the falſhood of a certain *Poſition* mentioned before. And therefore I hope it could be no Crime in me to call for ſome *proof* of *this*, upon which the *Argument* reſted, eſpecially ſince it was not a *point* impoſed by me; but an *affirmative* of your *Lordſhip*'s: And on the ſide of an *affirmative* you contend that demonſtration may moſt juſtly be expected. Whether your *Lordſhip* hath, under the preceding Head, advanced ſufficient proof of this, the *Reader* will judge by comparing it with what I have juſt now replied.

4. My

4. My *Fourth Reply* was taken from your *Lordſhip*'s Conceſſion, that there is no ſuch thing as *Natural Right* to *Civil Government*: Which I thought the beſt way of arguing I could have choſen. Your *Lordſhip* denies that you meant the *Conceſſion* as I underſtood it; and hath now revoked it, if ever it were meant ſo. Whether I had reaſon to underſtand it as I did, hath appeared from what I have already ſaid to this, under the *Second general Head*: But the main *Cauſe* depends not upon my having *miſtaken*, or *not miſtaken*, this matter.

5. My *Fifth Reply* was only deſign'd to ſhew the *poſſibility* of laying the foundation of *Civil Government* in *Voluntary Compact*, and *Conſent*, by inſtancing in ſome *Companies*, or *Clans* of Men without any *Eſtabliſhed Civil Government* amongſt them: Which *Eſtabliſhment*, therefore, cannot, I ſay, be founded *rightfully* upon any thing, but their *Conſent*. In anſwer to this, your *Lordſhip* is pleaſed to name another way of *rightfully ſettling* it, and that is, the *immediate interpoſition of Almighty God*, p. 41. But I believe no one could poſſibly underſtand me otherwiſe than as ſpeaking of the ordinary courſe of things, under the guidance of the ordinary Providence of *God*. If I ſhould ſay that the only *rightful* way of recovering the poſſeſſion of an *Eſtate* is to make appear the beſt *legal Right* to it; would any one deny this, becauſe there is another way, *viz.* by the miraculous interpoſition of *God Almighty* in his behalf? Your *Lordſhip* ſaith, there is no other *rightful Title* to *Government*, but a *legal* one. Would it become me, in anſwer to this, to *hope* that your *Lordſhip* will allow, that if *God Almighty* ſhould immediately appoint a Perſon to Govern, this would be a *rightful Title*?

But your *Lordſhip* not only allegeth this, but offers ſeveral other difficulties upon this Head of *Conſent*, all which will, I think, be anſwered by putting the *Caſe*, in very few words, as it ought to be: And all which, ſhall, in due time, be conſidered more at length, as I have already promiſed. Let us at preſent therefore, only ſuppoſe ſeveral Families of *Men*, *Women*, and *Children*, flying from *Tyranny*, and *Miſery*, to have been caſt by the *Providence* of *God*, upon an unpoſſeſs'd part of a *Continent*; the other parts of which we will ſuppoſe full of Inhabitants. Theſe Perſons may find *Enemies*, even amongſt themſelves, to their *Common Quiet*; as well as many *Acts* of *Violence*, and *Rapine*, threatned from the

Inhabitants of the *other Parts:* Here, in the firſt place, it is plain, that *all* who can do it, have Authority to defend themſelves, and their *Brethren*, againſt theſe *Enemies* of both ſorts; and are obliged, in reaſon to do it, as opportunity offers; and might frequently have *Aſſemblies* for this purpoſe, to which as many, as pleaſed, might come. But let us ſuppoſe, that, thinking it more convenient to entruſt this matter of *Self-defenſe*, and their *Common Intereſt*, with ſome particular Perſons, whoſe buſineſs, in a peculiar manner, it ſhould be to adviſe amongſt themſelves, and to iſſue out Orders, and Commands, for the public good; any part of thoſe preſent in one of theſe *Aſſemblies*, ſhould reſolve upon a particular *Perſon*, or *Perſons*, to inveſt with this Office; here it is plain, that nothing is neceſſary for the ſettling of *Civil Government* amongſt them, but this *Conſent*, by which they give an *Authority* which they had before in themſelves: And it is the dictate of *Reaſon*, which is the Voice of *God*, that they ſhould do thus. A *Civil Society*, with *ſettled Governours*, would by this means be formed: Which *Governours* would have a *Right* to defend this *Society* againſt all *Enemies*, whether *Men*, *Women*, and *Children*; whether ſuch as were of the ſame *Body* before, or ſuch as were older Inhabitants of other parts of the ſame Land. If others of them who *diſſent* from this, thinking other Methods better, depart, and ſettle another *Society*, under a different form of *Civil Government*; here will be another *Government* ſettled by *Conſent:* And this will have the ſame right likewiſe to defend it ſelf from all ſorts of Enemies. If the *Wives* of any, diſlike theſe proceedings; yet, the *Matrimonial Contract* is an obligation upon them not to be *Enemies* to that *Socity*, in which their *Huſbands* have fixed themſelves: But if they *be* ſo; the *Society* is to be defended from *them*, as from other *Enemies*. If any of their *Children*, upon coming to the uſe of their own *Reaſon*, *diſſent*; this doth not prove that the *Goverment* was not rightfully ſettled amongſt *them* who did conſent to it. Theſe *Children*, muſt either remove; or, if they live within the reach of it, muſt ſubmit at leaſt to what they cannot approve of: Otherwiſe the *Society* hath a *Right* to be defended againſt *them*, as *Public Enemies*. Hence it is plain, that tho' the *Conſent* of *ſome* doth not neceſſarily conclude thoſe who *diſſent*; yet it ſettles a *Civil Government* amongſt thoſe who

who *consent*; and gives the *Civil Governour* such an *Authority* over those who *dissent* from it, as that He may *Rightfully* make Laws, and execute them, against all Persons, of all *Ages*, *Sexes*, and *Conditions*, who endanger the safety of this *Community*: Which, I hope, is a sufficient answer to what your *Lordship* urgeth, p. 39. But I may well be excused from naming the precise time when *Consent* form'd the very first *Civil Government*, and the Person to whom the *Invention* was owing, as your *Lordship* seems to expect, p. 35. Since you are pleased your self to own, with respect to your own *Scheme*, that the most *antient* and *sacred History* is so short as to give not the least account of any *Act* of the *Regal Government* of *Adam*, or his *Heirs* for that long space of time before the Flood: And since I can go so far as out of that short *History* to give an *instance* which makes it very probable that there was a space of time at first, without an *Established Civil Government*: *viz.* That of *Cain*, who, upon occasion of his Murthering *Abel*, did not express a fear of being taken, and judicially tried and condemned by *Adam*; but of being *killed* by any of mankind, who should meet him; which is not the fear of a *Murtherer* under any *settled Civil Government*. Yet if your *Lordship* will trust the best *Historians*, and the wisest Heads amongst the *Heathens*, they will tell you the very Men to whom some particular *Neighbourhoods*, by *consent*, subjected themselves, which before had no settled form of *Civil Government*: As shall be more fully discoursed on another occasion.

My *Sixth Reply* was this, that supposing your *Lordship* should be able to prove the *Authority* of *Governours* to come from *God*, in the highest sense possible; I could not see the great advantage of this to the *Cause* you *defend*; that is, as I there explain it, the *Governed* may, notwithstanding this, have a right to save themselves from being *ruined* even by their *Governours*; and may have as immediate a *Commission* from *God* for *Self-preservation*, and *Self-defense*. That the *contrary* to this is what your *Lordship* maintained under the covert of other words, is what I have plainly proved; that this *Point* of the *Divine Authority* of *Governours* was laboured by your *Lordship* in order to strengthen what you had before said of the *Exemption* of *Governours*; and to introduce, amongst the

the reſt, the inference about *Unlimited Non-reſiſtance*, will be plain to any one who will be at the pains to look into the *Sermon*. The *Cauſe* therefore, which your *Lordſhip* defends was not miſtaken by me: At leaſt, that the moſt *unlimited Non-reſiſtance* of *Subjects* is *one* of the *Cauſes* defended by you, *your Lordſhip* doth not deny. And therefore this *Reply* ſtands good, having nothing alleged againſt it, but that I have *miſrepreſented* your *Senſe*, as to the *Extent* of the *Authority* of the *Magiſtrate*; of which I have given a full account already.

To what follows, p. 47. I have ſufficiently anſwered already. Your *Lordſhip confined* all your *Argument*, as you ſometimes your ſelf contend, to the *Emperour*, or *Supreme Magiſtrate*. You do here acknowledge that *Deputed Magiſtrates* were likewiſe ſpoken of by St. *Paul*. From whence I have argued that nothing can be inferred, merely from St. *Paul*'s words, with reſpect to the *Supreme*, which may not likewiſe be inferred, concerning the *Subordinate*.

The only thing remaining, that comes under this *Third General Head* of my preſent deſign, is your *Lordſhip*'s Reply to the *Queſtion* I asked, *Conſider*. p. 40. *In what are Magiſtrates the Miniſters of God*, conſidered as *exceeding the bounds of their Commiſſion?* To which your *Lordſhip* replies, p. 49. that I ſhould firſt have anſwered a few *Queſtions*, which the latter part of the ſame ſentence that gave occaſion to my *Queſtion*, *did, by implication, put to any Perſon that ſhould be in the mind to take exceptions*, &c. From whence I beg leave to argue, in my own behalf, that if it would have been no *Crime* in me here to have charged your *Lordſhip* with asking *Queſtions*, by *implication*; it cannot be a *Crime* in me, in other places, to have *charged* you with *Poſitions*, tho' only by *implication*, and not in expreſs words, affirmed. But, as to the *Queſtions* here propoſed; To the *firſt* I have anſwered at full length, in the 2. *Chap.* of the *Meaſures* of *Submiſſion*; as likewiſe to the *Third*; having there laid down, and vindicated my *interpretation* of *Rom.* 13. 1, 2, *&c.* from whence any *Reader* may ſee, that, as I cannot make *Tyranny* the *Miniſtry* of *God*; ſo I never thought of confining St. *Paul*'s Precepts to any particular time, but have pleaded for the extent of them, rightly underſtood, to all Ages of the Goſpel. And for the *Second*, about the *Laws* of the *Empire*, I think it evident from St. *Paul* himſelf, that, as yet,

*Chri-*

*Christians*, equally with all other Men, were protected by them in their *Privileges* and *Properties*. And, upon the contrary supposition, I have given a *Reply* to this *Difficulty*, in the *Measures* of *Submission*, p. 141. I shall not therefore now trouble your *Lordship* unnecessarily upon these *Heads*, because I find nothing alleged here against what I formerly advanced; and because I have a new occasion given me, by a very *Ingenious* and *Celebrated Author*, particularly to consider these *Difficulties*. To return therefore,

The *Question* proposed by me was this, In what is it that the *Magistrate*, whilst He is transgressing his *Commission*, is the *Minister* of *God*, or hath the *Authority* of *God*? Your *Lordship* answers, p. 50. that, *tho' as bad Magistrates they Transgress God's Rules, yet as Magistrates, or Governours, they are still the Ministers of God*. The meaning of which, as it it is in Answer to this *Question*, must be this; that, as *bad Magistrates*, they are without all *Commission* from *God*; but as *Magistrates*, as *Officers* truly deserving that name, they have his *Commission*: That is, in other words, that, in whatsoever they do against the *Ends* of their *Office*, they are without *Authority*; but in whatsoever they do agreeably to the *Office* of *Magistrates*, they are his *Ministers*. Which is the very thing for which I am contending. The *simile* by which your *Lordship* endeavours to explain it, is this. *Just as a Priest is the Ecclesiastical Minister of God, and actually, the Minister of Jesus Christ, even at the very time that He exceeds the bounds of his Commission, and is preaching contrary to his Gospel*. To which I humbly reply, that this Man, in the doingthis, whover He be, is the *Minister*, not of *Jesus Christ*, but of the great Enemy of Mankind. His being the *Minister* of *Jesus Christ*, in the Preaching his Will, or Baptizing Believers, or Propagating his *Faith*, cannot make him the *Minister* of *Christ*, even whilst He is Preaching against *Christ*, dishonouring his *Gospel*, and arguing Men into Infidelity. And therefore, I cannot but wish your *Lordship* had worded this after another manner. For if your *Lordship* only means, that even whilst He is Preaching *against* Christ, He hath Authority to Preach *for* him; that whilst He is shewing himself the *Minister* of an *Evil Spirit*, He is by his *Office* oblig'd to be the *Minister* of *Christ*; this may be true, but is nothing against what I have alleged. For in this *Case*, I likewise think

these

theſe two things very evident. 1. That the *People* are ſtrictly obliged not to obey *Him* in any thing which they know to be contrary to *Chriſt*'s Law, even tho' he Preach it under the pretext of his having Authority to Preach the contrary. And, 2. That, ſuppoſing the continuance of his *Prieſtly Authority*, in any Points, becomes inconſiſtent with the intereſt, and preſervation of *Chriſt*'s *Church*, He is from that inſtant deveſted of all *Authority*; I ſay, ſuppoſing it certain that He cannot retain his *Authority* which was once given Him, without the ruine of the *Church*. This *Caſe*, cannot, as I know of, happen. But I put it thus, to make it parallel with the *Caſe* of *Civil Authority*, of which I ſaid theſe two things, 1. That a *Prince* cannot have *God*'s *Authority*, in any one ſingle inſtance, to act againſt the end of his Office: Tho' whilſt He is doing it, it may be true, that He hath *Commiſſion* and *Authority*, to do the contrary. 2. That when his having *Power* becomes inconſiſtent with the preſervation of the *Community*, and good of the *People*, it cannot be *God*'s Will that he ſhould be kept in Poſſeſſion of *Power*; or that his *Commiſſion* to do the *Office* of a *Magiſtrate* to a *Nation*, ſhould continue when He cannot do that in any reſpect, without ruining it by ſome other parts of his *Conduct*. But, as I have obſerv'd already, ſo I muſt obſerve again, that I never ſaid, or thought, that a Man's *Right* to *Govern*, or *Authority* to exerciſe the *Office* of a *Magiſtrate* was wholy vacated by any ſingle inſtance of miſmanagement; or any thing like it, as your *Lordſhip* repreſents me, p. 49. But this I now ſay, with Relation to the inſtance of a *Mayor* of a *Corporation*, there again urged by your *Lordſhip*; that ſhould this *Mayor*, under the pretext of his *Commiſſion*, break into the Houſes of the *Free-men*, and attaque their lives, I cannot but think that the *Law* of the *Land*, as well as of *Reaſon*, would juſtify them in uſing Him as a *Common Robber*; and if the conſequence of that ſhould be that his *Commiſſion* ſhould be at an *End*, with his *Life*, would even then acquit them of the guilt of *Murther*. But the only way, in which I apply all this to the *Supreme Civil Magiſtrate* is this, that his *Commiſſion* gives him a *Right* to *Rule* no longer than his *having Power* is conſiſtent with the preſervation, and ſafety of the whole *Community*: But ceaſes to give *Right*, when his *Government* is to the *ruine* of the whole.

To

To what your *Lordſhip* cites out of a Modern *Author*, p. 51. I only anſwer, That the *Whole Duty of Man*, is, and ever will be an *excellent Book*; but that I know of no way more likely to leſſen its credit in the World, than to quote it as if it were the work of an inſpired, infallible Judgment; free from all Error, in every particular. The Example of *David*, there alleged, I have long ago ſhewn to be the example of a *Subject*, defending himſelf by *Arms* againſt his *Sovereign*, the *Lord's Anointed* in a proper ſenſe of the words: But no notice is taken of this. The Texts of *Scripture* there cited have been already largely diſcuſſed: Nor is there any proof offered there, that theſe *Texts* do lay whole *Nations* of *Subjects* at once, under the neceſſity of ſubmitting to *ruine*.

I have thus, my *Lord*, preſumed once again to conſider every one of thoſe points, urged in the *Conſiderations*, about which there ſtill ſeemed to remain any diſpute between us: And, I humbly hope, have ſet them in a juſt light.

And now it is fit for me to take ſome notice of what your *Lordſhip* hath added, in this *Anſwer*, againſt my *Doctrine*, to what was before advanced in your *Sermons*. For tho' your *Lordſhip* hath often profeſſed that you would not *touch* upon the matter of *Self defenſe*, or the late *Revolution*, yet it cannot be diſſembled that your *Lordſhip* hath, in reality, *touched* upon *them*, and upon *me* for defending them, after a very remarkable, and very ſevere manner.

1. It is more than once inſinutated that the *Doctrine* maintained by me cannot be reconciled with St. *Paul*; or with my ſubſcribing to the *Homilies*; or, as your *Lordſhip* ſeems to intend in ſome of the laſt *pages* of your *Anſwer*, with the general *Declarations* of *Scripture* concerning the *ſubmiſſion* of *Children*, and of *Slaves*; or with the *Liturgy* of our *Church*, to which I have given *Aſſent*, and *Conſent*. For the *three* firſt of theſe; I have largely conſidered them, in the *Meaſures* of *Submiſſion*, to which I may juſtly refer the *Reader*, becauſe your *Lordſhip* hath not attempted to invalidate thoſe Arguments, by which I think I have fully proved the contrary: And an ingenious *Author*, by urging theſe *objections* again, in a very particular manner, hath laid a neceſſity upon me of conſidering them once more. As to the *laſt*, the contradicting the *Liturgy*; the *particulars* mentioned by your *Lordſhip* are theſe, *viz. whoſe Miniſter ſhe is, whoſe Authority ſhe hath*,

and *the only Ruler of Princes*, which you call *ſtubborn Expreſſions*, &c. *p.* 40. and give unkind intimations, as if I could not heartily *aſſent* to them. To this therefore, I anſwer, 1. That there is no Perſon living who can more heartily ſay that *Her Majeſty* is the *Miniſter* of *God*, becauſe there is no one to whoſe whole *Scheme* of *Principles* it is more agreeable ſincerely to believe, that this may be juſtly affirmed of ſo excellent a *Princeſs*, who recommends Virtue by her Example; puts in execution wholeſom Laws againſt Vice; ſupports the *Cauſe* of *Liberty*, and the *Proteſtant Religion* with zeal and perſeverance; and anſwers ſo truly to St. *Paul*'s Character, *the Miniſter of God to us for good*. And how the contrary can be intimated of *me*, who have been all along contending that this *Character*, in St. *Paul*, belongs to *Magiſtrates* anſwering the *Ends* of their *Office*, and carrying on an uſeful work in the World, without inſinuating at the ſame time ſomething which, I dare ſay, is wholly contrary to your *Lordſhip*'s thoughts, I leave to others.

2. *Whoſe Authority ſhe hath* is an expreſſion ſo far from being a *ſeeming contradiction* to my Principles, that it is peculiarly agreeable to them. I am ſorry, your *Lordſhip* hath given me this occaſion: But *Self-defenſe* makes it juſtifiable for me to ſay that, tho' I make not the leaſt doubt of your *Lordſhip*'s ſincere Love, and hearty Zeal for her *Majeſty*, and her *Government*, yet, you cannot be led by your Principles, ſo heartily to affirm that her *Majeſty* hath *God*'s *Authority*, as I am ready to affirm it every day of my Life. For, maintaining the Lawfulneſs and Honourableneſs of the firſt ſteps of the *Revolution*; and heartily believing that the *Nations* chuſing *Repreſentatives*, and theſe *Repreſentatives*, together with the *Lords*, voluntarily conſenting to make K. *William*, and Q. *Mary* their *Civil Governours*, was approved by *God*; that, upon that *Conſent*, it was the Will of God Almighty that *they* ſhould have *right* to *Rule*; and that all the *Acts*, for the *ſecurity* of the *Nation*, paſſed by *Them*, and that *Parliament*, ſhould not only be valid at preſent, with reſpect to the *Subject*, but *Authoritative* in themſelves: Holding all this, I ſay, I can heartily believe and declare that her *Majeſty* hath *God*'s *Authority*; hath a *Right* to *Rule* moſt agreeable to *God*'s Will; confirm'd, and eſtabliſhed by his moſt certain approbation, which cannot be wanting, according to *my* Principles, in ſuch a Caſe as this. Whereas, as I have ſhewn

&c.

already, your *Lordſhip* condemning all the firſt ſteps which led to this *Settlement*, and allowing of no *Right* in *Subjects* to depart, in any Caſe, from the ordinary ſettled Methods, ccannot, as I conceive, ſo readily give the *Divine Approbation* to the *Settlement* it ſelf; or, to the *Government* of *any*, whoſe *Title*, and *Poſſeſſion*, are founded originally, in that *Reſiſtance*, which you condemn as down right *Rebellion*. I hope your *Lordſhip* hath not ſo miſtaken me as to think that I have pleaded abſolutely againſt giving a *Divine Authority* to *Princes*. For I have only pleaded againſt it, (as the Judicious *Hooker*, in effect, did long ago,) in a ſenſe inconſiſtent with *Humane Conſent* and *Compact*: And I aſſure your *Lordſhip* that my Principles are ſuch, as unavoidably lead me to declare, and maintain, ſuch a *Governour* as our *Queen*, brought to the *Throne* by ſo Honourable Methods, and exerciſing her Power after ſo excellent and beneficial a manner, to be clothed with *God*'s Authority; to have her *Right* confirmed by his Will; to be his *Miniſter*, his *Vice-gerent*, his *Repreſentative* in this lower World. But all this indeed, without offering *Her* the *Vaſſalage* of *Slaves*, inſtead of the *Obedience* of *Subjects*.

3. I do likewiſe ſay from my Heart that *God is the only Ruler of Princes*: And am ready to ſhew that I no more contradict this by allowing the whole *Community* a *Right* to defend themſelves againſt a *Prince* certainly attempting their Ruine, than your *Lordſhip* doth by allowing to her *Majeſty* a *Right* to defend her ſelf, and her *People*, againſt the *French King*. For God is *the only Ruler of* the *French King*, as well as of other Princes. If, therefore, no one hath a *Right* to Cenſure and Puniſh another, who is not *Superior* to, and *Ruler* of this other; then hath not her *Majeſty* a *Right* to *Cenſure* and *Puniſh* the *French King*. But your *Lordſhip* will allow and contend that *She* hath this *Right*, as far as is implied in the *Defenſe* of the World about Him; tho' *God* is his only *Ruler*: From whence it follows that the whole *Gallic Community* may have the ſame *Right* againſt Him, notwithſtanding any thing in this expreſſion. The *one* being *Subjects*, the other a *Prince*, makes no difference as to this Argument: Becauſe one *Prince* is no more the *Ruler* of another *Prince*, than a whole Nation is the *Ruler* of their own *Prince*. And conſequently, if your *Lordſhip* can read *this* in the *Common-Prayer-Book*, whilſt you allow the *French King* to be *Accountable* to her *Majeſty* and her *Allies*, and grant them a *Right* to *Cenſure* and *Puniſh* Him, as

far as their *Common Cauſe* requires; I may reaſonably hope that your *Lordſhip* will not again *inſinuate* that I cannot as heartily *aſſent* to the ſame paſſage, merely becauſe I plead for ſuch a *Right* to *Self-defenſe* in a whole Nation, as muſt ſometimes imply in it *Cenſure* and *Puniſhment*: Since this Principle of mine is no more inconſiſtent with the declaring *God* to be the only *Ruler* of Princes, than your own allowing *Princes*, and *States*, to Cenſure and Puniſh other *Princes*, whoſe *only Ruler* God is. This is fully ſufficient for my own juſtification, without examining more nicely into the true meaning of the *Phraſe*.

2. But this is not the only manner, in which your *Lordſhip* hath, in this laſt *Anſwer*, touched upon the *Revolution*, and *Self defenſe*, &c. The *Account* given of the true Notion of a *Public Benefactor*, p. 26. compared with the effectual declaring *Reſiſtance* to be an *unlawful and unwarrantable* Method of ſaving *Subjects* from Ruine; the making *Reſiſtance*, even in *Caſes* of *Extreme Exigency*, the ſame with *Rebellion*, and the *dictate* of *Corrupt Humane Nature*, *which* is not *ready to ſubmit to the Reſtraints that are laid upon it by God and Religion*, p. 55; the interpreting *Acts* of *Parliament* ſo as to contradict my *Doctrine*, and ſo as to make the *Executive Power* alone, and acting without, and even againſt the *Legiſlative*, in all poſſible Caſes, irreſiſtible, *p.* 28; the almoſt conſtant joining *Reſiſtance*, and *Rebellion* together, that ſo they may appear, in all Caſes, the ſame; the taking occaſion from my calling the *Revolution* a *Rebellion*, by way of *Irony*, and with regard to ſome Principles, in effect, to call it ſo very ſeriouſly, *p.* 48; the joining me with thoſe who ſuffered for the Murther of K. *Charles* I. *p.* 52. only for juſtifying the *Self defenſe* practiſed by a *whole Community*, and the Conduct of all thoſe, from the *Higheſt* to the *Loweſt*, who ſaved this *Nation* by joining themſelves to the *Arms* of the P. of *Orange*; the making ſuch repreſentations of me, and my *Doctrine*, in many places, as that her *Majeſty*, (to whom an appeal is made by your *Lordſhip*) muſt needs judge that I am ſowing *Sedition*, fomenting *Diſturbances*, and raiſing *Rebellion* amongſt her *Subjects*, whilſt I am doing Her true and faithful Service. Theſe, and the like, too many to dwell upon, carry nothing indeed of *Argument* along with them: But they effectually and very ſeverely *touch* upon the *Late Revolution*, and *National Self-defenſe*; as well as upon *me*, whoſe only Crime it is to have defend-

ed

ed *them.* And as they ſufficiently ſhew your *Lordſhip*'s preſent diſpoſition; ſo they contain in them ſuch *Accuſations* againſt me, as make it neceſſary, before I conclude,

IV. To add ſomething by way of *Apology* for my ſelf, and the part which I have acted in this *Cauſe.*

My *Lord*,

I am very ſenſible that it can by no means become me to follow your *Lordſhip* in an *Appeal* to her *Excellent Majeſty*; or ſo much as to hope that any thing written by ſo unworthy a Perſon can ever be thought worthy of the leaſt regard from *Her.* But if, moved by your *Lordſhip*'s Repreſentations, She ſhould condeſcend ſo far as to enquire, *What my Crime is*, I am not ſo great an Enemy to my ſelf, as not to wiſh that She may receive another, and very different Account of the matter. 1. That my *Crime* with reſpect to the *Goſpel* of *Jeſus Chriſt* is this; the endeavouring to prove that the *general Precepts* of it, concerning the *Duty* of *Subjects*, ought not to be ſo interpreted as to lay *whole Nations* under the neceſſity of ſubmitting to *Univerſal Slavery*, and *Ruine*: and this not attempted by me, till a *Caſe* had actually happen'd in our own *Nation* which made it the *ſubject* of every *Honeſt Chriſtian*'s enquiry; and not till the *contrary deciſions* of Multitudes of *Writers* had made the *Conſciences* of many uneaſy in this Point; and diſſatisfied with the *Happy Eſtabliſhment* founded upon a *Practice* agreeable to this *Doctrine.* 2. That my *Crime*, with reſpect to her *Majeſty*, and her *Government*, is this, The endeavouring to juſtify her Conduct in that Glorious part which *She* bare in the late *Revolution*; to vindicate not only her *People*'s behaviour, in the *ſubmitting* to Her, but her own *Honour*, and *juſtice*, in *Poſſeſſing* a *Government* founded upon it; to reconcile the Affections of her *Subjects* to the *Baſis* upon which it ſtands, that ſo they may not only *ſubmit*, but approve; not only *approve* but *love*; not only *love*, but *zealouſly defend* it againſt all *oppoſers*; to demonſtrate that it is not ſettled upon *Uſurpation*, or *Sin*; but upon a lawful Practice; and on that *Conſent* which is the ſureſt band of a *Manly obedience* in *Subjects*; the firmeſt *Title* of *Sovereignty* to *Princes*; and ever ſecure of the ſupport of *God*'s *Authority*, when it exerts it ſelf after ſo unblameable, and beneficial a manner. If the *Caſe* were thus truly repreſented, I ſhould not fear that a *Defender* of

theſe

these *Principles* could be esteemed by her *Majesty* an *Enemy* to her *Government*: Especially if it were added, that, whilst I have been asserting this *Right* in a whole *Nation*, I have ever taken the same opportunity of earnestly recommending her excellent *Conduct* to the affections of her *People*; that whilst I have been doing the *former*, in order to secure the *foundation*, I have not failed to do the *latter*, for the security of *her self*; that so her *Administration* might appear as lovely to her *Subjects*, as her *Title* is *Glorious*, and unreprovable: That I have ever set my self to oppose those *Jealousies*, and *Surmises*, *by* which *others* were shaking the quiet and safety of her *Government*; and particularly, at the time when the *Pretender* was threatning an Invasion, and when some, of other Principles, were openly attaquing the *Administration*, and endeavouring to overthrow her *Right*; I thought it a most seasonable Duty to Assert, and Vindicate it, to as high a degree, and in as public a manner as possible; tho' I was afterwards publickly abused for it by the great *Advocate* for the *Pretender*'s Cause; as I am, for the whole, now represented as an *Enemy* to *Government*; of *Levelling Principles*, and I know not what. But if, after all I can say, this must be my Lot; may God forgive those who make it so! May the unhappiness be only mine, to suffer under the Reputation of being an *Enemy* to a *Queen*, whose *Conduct*, whose *Title*, whose *Administration*, it hath been my peculiar, and long-continued Labour to recommend to the *delight*, the *approbation*, the zeal of her *People*: and may it be the unenvied good fortune of *others* to be able to demonstrate their Love to *Her Majesty* by disapproving her *Practice*; to shew their *zeal* for her *Government* by condemning the *foundation* upon which it stands; and to recommend it, if possible, to the *affections* of her *People*, by proving it to be the consequence of a *successful Rebellion!*

Not that I would have it insinuated, my *Lord*, that those, who are not of the *same Principles*, may not come in to a *Government* now settled, the *first Settlement* of which they could not approve of; or may not be good *Subjects* to it, as long as it can maintain it self; or may not, by some Considerations, be induced even to *Wish* the continuance of it. But I would appeal to your *Lordship*; or to the professed *Enemies* of the *Government* who may judge in this *Case* more impartially than either of us; whether they do not find

find their account in their continual recommending the *Principles* of *Abſolute Non-reſiſtance*; whether they do not frequently make the *Conſciences* of Men uneaſy at the preſent *Settlement* merely by making them uneaſy at the *Foundation* on which it ſtands; whether their *Great Advocate* could have done any thing more to his purpoſe, than, under pretenſe of vindicating your *Lordſhip*, to manage both your *Principles*, and your *Authority*, againſt our *Eſtabliſhment*. I would appeal to them, to judge, who are they that are moſt likely both by *Principle*, and *Affection*, to defend this *Government* to the laſt extremity; *They* who are guided by their *Conſciences* into all the *Meaſures* by which it is Eſtabliſhed, and into the love of the firſt ſteps that led to it; or *they* who are induced, or permitted by their *Conſciences* to *ſubmit* to it, as long as it can protect them. Or, let all the World judge who are moſt likely to be the firmeſt Friends to that *Eſtabliſhment* by which her *Majeſty* Reigns; *they* whoſe Principles would have engaged them to bear an active part in thoſe ſteps, by which *She* came to the Throne; or *they*, whoſe Principles muſt have engaged them to abhor thoſe ſteps, and to have acted ſuch a *Paſſive Part*, as muſt have ended in the ruine of *Her*; the *Conſtitution*; and the whole *Proteſtant Nation*. Take a Perſon, who believes in his Conſcience the lawfulneſs of that *Reſiſtance* by which the *Nation* hath been ſaved: And you will find in him a Zeal, and Ardour, to maintain the *Government*, at any expenſe, againſt all *Oppoſers*. If you find an *Alteration*, or *Coldneſs*, at any time, you will find likewiſe an *Alteration* in his *profeſſing* that *Principle*; or that He expects the ſupport of his Intereſt from Men of the contrary Mind. Take one, who by never ſo long Study hath argued himſelf into *Mere Submiſſion* to a *Government* founded upon this *Reſiſtance*: And you will very frequently ſee a great *Indifference*, a mixture of Uneaſineſs, and Diſcontent; and a readineſs to catch at every little thing to the diſadvantage of this *Settlement*. I am far from ſaying, it is always thus; but that this is generally the Caſe: and that whatever *Zeal* there is on one ſide, whatever *Coldneſs* on the *other*, is generally owing to the *Principles*, on each ſide embraced, with reſpect to *Reſiſtance* alone, is too plain to be denied. Or, take a Perſon, if ſuch an one can be found, who hath from *Mere Submiſſion* to the *Government* been argued into a belief of the lawfulneſs of the *Reſiſtance* by which it came to be ſettled: And

let him declare, whether, upon this alteration, He hath not found himself more perfectly easy and satisfied, even in his *Submission*; and more heartily fixed in his opposition to that *former Settlement*, from which the *Nation* is departed. Nay, let past *Experience* determine from whence all the impediments to this *Settlement* came; from whence the Reluctance to fill the Throne at first; from whence the unwillingness to Swear to it when it was full; from whence the difficulties that *clog'd* all designs for supporting it against the *Common Enemy*; from whence the delays, and objections, to retard Supplies, and to embarrass Affairs in the late Reign; from whence the greatest part of the uneasiness at this War with *France*; from whence the dislike to the framing and passing the Act of *Settlement*; from whence the visible *dissatisfaction*, discovered upon every success of the *Common Arms*, and the *joy* which betrays it self, upon every little imaginary Advantage of the *Common Enemy*; from whence, in one word, the *Zeal* of *some* for the *former* Settlement; and the *Indifference* of *others* for the *present*. From what Principle have these unhappinesses come but from this one, That a *Nation* must not be allowed, without a *damnable sin*, to go out of the methods of *Submission*, even to save it self from Ruine? From what Persons, but either from those who really believe this *Doctrine*, or have openly professed to do it; or from those whose Interest hath ever been supported by such as zealously espouse it?

Alass! My *Lord*, I am not the *first* who have looked back, beyond *mere Submission*, to the *Foundation* upon which the *Queen*, and her *People* jointly stand. *They* look back to it, who are ever endeavouring to Arm Mens Minds against the present *Establishment* by condemning the *Methods* that led to it. *They* look back to it, who, without any such design, effectually do the same thing. The *Interest* of the *Nation* therefore requires, and obligeth others to *look back* to it, after another manner: For who cannot see that it is the *interest* of the *Nation* that *all* should be perfectly satisfied in the *Foundation* of an *Establishment*, which even its *Enemies* would acknowledge *Happy*, could they approve of the *beginnings* that introduced it? If these *Enemies* look back to it with an *Evil Eye*; why may not others be allowed to cast a *Favourable Eye* upon it? Nay, Why should not something be done towards the satisfaction of the *Consciences* of these *professed*

*ſeſſed Adverſaries*, who would come in as *Friends*, did they not ſtick at this one Point, which I have endeavour'd to vindicate? This, methinks, may juſtify me in what I have done, as I am a *Member* of this *Community*, whoſe Happineſs, in all probability, lives, and dies with the preſent *Eſtabliſhment*.

Nor is it leſs neceſſary, or leſs juſtifiable for *Us*, who are the *Miniſters* of the *Goſpel*, to look farther than to *Mere Submiſſion* to this *Settlement*, becauſe the *Caſe* of the *Revolution* is a *Public*, *National Caſe of Conſcience*; and the lawfulneſs, or unlawfulneſs of the like Practice is a *Caſe*, in which both *Clergy* and *Laity* of this Land, have, long before my time, thought their *Conſciences* extremely concerned. Were it only on this laſt account, it could not be inexcuſable in any *Clergy-man* to debate this matter in a *Theological* manner. But on the *former*, it hath, I think, become abſolutely neceſſary that, one way or other, it ſhould be put as much out of doubt as poſſible. For the matter is now reduc'd to this, whether we lie under a *National Guilt*, or not. If the *Nation* ſin'd againſt *God* in inviting over the *Arms* of *Reſiſtance*, or in joining themſelves to them when they were come; or in caſting off their Allegiance to one *King*, and fixing it to another, by illegal methods; this is a *National Guilt*. And tho' this may bring along with it Temporal good Conſequences; it is nevertheleſs a *Guilt*. Nor do I ſee, my *Lord*, but that *they* who only accept of this deliverance, and ſubmit themſelves to the *Government* ſettled by it, muſt ſtill partake of this *guilt*, even tho' they did not approve of it; unleſs they be ready, upon a good opportunity, to return to the former Courſe. Becauſe this, according to their *Principles*, is not like the accepting a deliverance from one *Robber*, by the means of *another*; but it is like a *Child*'s accepting of a deliverance at the hands of one who hath no right to interpoſe; and likewiſe eſcaping, and withdrawing obedience, from an unreaſonable Father, who ſtill Claims, and Challenges this Obedience. So did the *Nation*, according to ſome Men, accept of a deliverance, brought about by unlawful means, from the Power of a *Prince*, who, they hold, could not forfeit his Title to their *Allegiance*; who, I am ſure, always kept up his Claim to it; and who was, to them, their *legal King*, without whoſe *Act* no Alteration in the *Conſtitution* could be made. Now what follows from

hence? Muſt there not be a *National Repentance*? And can there be a *National Repentance*, in caſe of a *National Injuſtice*, without *Reſtitution*? Without the *Reſtitution* of their *Allegiance*, according to that *Settlement* from which they are departed? This, my *Lord*, is what I fear; that, if this muſt ſtill go for a *National Guilt*, and the *Nation* ſhould be perſuaded into the *Principles* that lead to this, nothing can be the *End*, but to return to the *old Courſe*; and to truſt *Almighty God* for the Conſequences, as ſome expreſs it; that is, in truth, to tempt *Almighty God*, who hath no where promiſed, without their own Concurrence, to ſave them from *Ruine*; or, in other words, from a *Popiſh Eſtabliſhment* both in *Church* and *State*. And if this be ſo; one would think it might at leaſt be pardonable in me, to endeavour to ſhew that the *Nation* is not under the *guilt* of any ſuch *Injuſtice*, and therefore not under the obligation to make any ſuch *Reſtitution*; that they had a *Right* to ſave themſelves from *ruine*, and to conſult their future ſecurity; that the *Laws* of *God* forbid it not; and that their *guilt* would now lie in returning, even in their Hearts, to *Egypt*. If this be a matter then of infinite moment, relating both to the National, and Eternal Puniſhment of the *People* of this Land, how can it be a task improper for a *Divine*, to endeavour to ſet it in as clear a light as poſſible?

Beſides, whether We will or no; The Minds of Men are ſo framed that they *muſt*, they *will* look back to the *Foundations* upon which their *preſent State* is fixed; eſpecially when the matter is within the reach of their own memory, and they themſelves perhaps were perſonally engaged in it. If a ſudden paſſion, or a ſtrong Senſe of *Temporal Intereſt*, puſhed them into *unlawful Methods*, the only way of regaining *God*'s Favour is to *unact* what they then *acted*, whilſt the way lies open; before length of time obſcures, and effaces thoſe *antient Paths* to which they ought in *Duty* to return. But if it can be ſhewn that their *judgments* were well informed; and that what they acted was both lawful, and honourable; it cannot be beneath our care thus to conſult the inward Peace of ſo many *Conſciences*; and thus to engage theſe Perſons to continue their faithful Services to the *Eſtabliſhment* which they help'd to found; who, by the *doubts* and *terrors*, infuſed into them by *others*, might have their Conſciences armed againſt the work of their own hands. In one word;

word; ſuppoſing the *Principles*, to which the preſent *Eſtabliſhment* owes its being, univerſally embraced; and any new attempts made by our *Enemies* to bring us to the *former Settlement*: Can any one deny that an *univerſal approbation* of the *Foundation* of it would fill every Breaſt, without exception, with an equal, unconquerable zeal againſt all ſuch attempts? Or can any one think that this is an happineſs to be hoped for, in the ſame degree, whilſt *Uneaſineſs*, and *Diſſatisfaction*, remain upon the Minds of Men, about the *National Guilt* incurred by *one Revolution*; *never*, according to ſome Principles, *to be done away* without a voluntary yielding to another?

But I will not treſpaſs any longer upon your *Lordſhip*. Theſe laſt *Conſiderations* I am not ſo weak as to urge as *Arguments* for the *truth* of my *Doctrine*; but for its *importance* to the preſent happy *ſtate* of the *Nation*: As *Apologies* for my ſelf againſt thoſe *perpetual Repreſentations*, by which I muſt otherwiſe ſuffer, as if I were troubling a *Nation* with the matter of *Reſiſtance* without the leaſt occaſion, and for very bad ends; as if no *Caſe* of *Reſiſtance* in which the preſent Generation is concern'd; no *Eſtabliſhment* conſequent upon that *Reſiſtance*; no *contrary deciſions* of the Enemies of this *Eſtabliſhment*; no *Enquiries* of *ſober Chriſtians*, had made this a ſeaſonable, a tolerable, or lawful undertaking for a *Miniſter* of the *Goſpel*. Whether in this, or the foregoing part of theſe *Papers* I have offered any thing worthy a *ſecond Notice*, I muſt leave entirely to *your Lordſhip*. If I have; whether your *Lordſhip* will think fit to commit the management of your *Cauſe* to *another hand*, I know not: But I perſuade my ſelf, that, if you ſhould do this, yet, for the ſake of the Honour of *Almighty God*, and of our *Common Chriſtianity*, your *Lordſhip* will not give a Public Approbation and Encouragement to any ſuch *licentiouſneſs* in writing as, I fear, muſt reflect a diſhonour upon your *High* and *Holy Character*; and cannot but be ſhocking to all *Modeſt*, and *ſerious Chriſtians*, who are ſeeking after *Truth*, more than *Diverſion*.

But, whatever my Fate ſhall be; however *others* may provoke your *Lordſhip* to order, or permit, me to be treated; this ſolemn Aſſurance I can give you: That, as I have conſcientiouſly avoided every thing that might tempt me to forget that *Decency* and *Reſpect* which it is my Duty to regard, keeping only to what the juſtifica-

tion of my ſelf, and my *Cauſe* hath made neceſſary; ſo no reſentment of the *paſt* or *future* ill-treatment of thoſe who write under the *Covert* of your *great Name*, ſhall ever provoke me, either by my own, or any other hand, to return to your *Lordſhip*, or to the meaneſt of them, the like to what I have experienced; or rob me of the ſatisfaction of *forgiving* what I dare not *imitate*. May *God Almighty* never lay to *their Charge*, what I have ſuffered from *any*! May the ſame good *God* crown your *Lordſhip* with his Favour, and Protection! confirm and eſtabliſh your Health! and, after a Life of all Worldly Proſperity, bring you to that Bleſſed State, in which *Truth* and *Happineſs* are eternally, and inſeparably united! Theſe are the hearty Prayers of,

My *Lord*,

Your *Lordſhip*'s moſt Obedient,

and moſt Humble Servant,

*BENJAMIN HOADLY.*

*Poſtſcript.*

# Poſtſcript.

I Beg leave, my *Lord*, upon this occaſion, to take Notice to your *Lordſhip*, that a *certain Author*, who wrote the laſt *Vindication* of your *Doctrine*, entitled, The *Beſt Anſwer ever was made*, &c. hath, under this pretenſe, given very juſt ground of loud Complaint. It is not, my *Lord*, that He openly Inſults the Memory of K. *William*, and the *Revolution* (which is not at all ſurprizing;) or that He openly *ridicules* the *Conſequences* of it, for which your *Lordſhip* hath expreſſed a great zeal; or that He inſinuates, as if his *Rehearſals* had been written on the ſide of the *Adminiſtration*; whilſt He means the *Eſtabliſhment* and *Adminiſtration* before the *Revolution*: As ſome *Papiſts* have profeſſed a *zeal* for the *Eſtabliſhed Church*, meaning *that Eſtabliſhed* before the *Uſurpation* of our *Proteſtant Princes*. It is not that He hath heartily laboured to make the minds of Her *Majeſty*'s Subjects uneaſy at that *War* which, *She* hath often declared, *She* thinks moſt *juſt and neceſſary*; and at that *Toleration*, which She hath aſſured her *Parliament*, She *will inviolably maintain*: At the ſame time declaring, as ſeriouſly as ſuch Principles permit him, the *Queen*'s *Adminiſtration to be perfect in every kind*, p. 73. It is not that He hath endeavoured to make the Nation diſſatisfied with the *Taxes*, and *Loſſes*, in this and the foregoing *Reign*, by ſetting againſt it the *Peace*, and *Security*, and *Plenty* of thoſe former *Reigns*, to which *theſe* Difficulties are entirely owing. It is not that He hath charged this long *War*, as a blot upon the *Revolution*, and the preſent *Eſtabliſhment*; the *neceſſity* of which is entirely owing to the *Arbitrary Power* of the *Common Enemy*, and the *Strength* gained by him under the inactivity, and ſupineneſs of the *Former Eſtabliſhment*; and the *declaration*, and *proſecution*, of which is indeed one of the *great Benefits* of this preſent *Eſtabliſhment*: Becauſe without it *Europe* in general, and *Britain* in particular muſt have been ruined; becauſe it was equally neceſſary to the intereſt of *both*, either *with*, or *without*, the *Revolution*; and yet, unleſs the *Revolution* had here ſucceeded, would not have been entred

tred into. Nor is it that He passeth over in silence the miserable Condition, in which We all had been without this hated *Revolution*; and the *Extreme Misery* of the *French Nation* merely through *Absolute Monarchy*, and the want of so happy a *Revolution* there. It is not on these accounts; tho' some of these must be entirely disagreeable to your *Lordship*. But it is because He could not persuade himself to spare even the *Queen* herself, by whose *Clemency* He lives unmolested. If you please to consult the last *page* of his *Preface*, you will find there that He first wrongfully chargeth your *Lordship* with maintaining that in *Hereditary Monarchies*, the *Right* unalienably descends; and me with *treating you roughly* upon a *contradiction* which never so much as enter'd into my thoughts; and then takes occasion to illustrate this invention of his own by an instance out of the 2 *Chronicles*, 23. *ch.* where the *High Priest* declares the right of *Joash* one of the *Sons* of the *Former King*, v. 3. *Behold the King's Son shall Reign, as the Lord hath said of the Sons of David: Tho'*, saith this Author, *Athaliah*, (who was the *Queen* in possession) *called this Treason, because it was against* De Facto. *For*, adds He, *she had reign'd in quiet possession Seven years.* If your *Lordship* can doubt whom this *Author* means by the *King's Son*, and *Queen Athaliah*, it is enough to consider that He had not the least occasion given him to mention this Instance; or only to cast your Eyes upon the last words, *Seven years.* For the *Scripture* saith, *Athaliah* had Reign'd but *Six years*, and was enter'd into her *Seventh:* But we know a good *Queen*, who hath not deserved such *Treatment* from the *Non-jurors themselves, that hath Reigned in quiet possession Seven years*, and is now entered into her *Eighth.* May *God* long protect Her against such *Friends* at Home! as well as against her *Enemies* Abroad! but, I hope, our *zeal* will be *common*, and *equal*, against the pretenses of *such* Men. What there is of *Argument* in his Book, mine will be the labour to examine, and consider seriously, when I come more largely to treat of some Points. But I persuade my self, your *Lordship* will rather thank, than blame, me, for mentioning this: Since I abhor the thought of making *You* responsible for the ungoverned Sallies of other Mens zeal; and since it will give you an opportunity of shewing all dislike, and giving all possible

dis-

discouragement to such dangerous *Writers*. And I hope that such repeated attempts of the *Common Enemies* will plead my *Apology* with all the *Friends* of the present *Establishment* for my repeated *endeavours* to prevent the increase of *Principles*, which, we see, are of so fatal and *pernicious Consequence* to the *Queen* herself, as well as the whole *Protestant Succession*. I beg leave only to put this *One Case*, before I conclude. This professed *Non-juror*, whose *Principles* oblige Him, in Conscience to wish, and design the Dissolution of the *Present Establishment*, is ever representing me as maintaining such *Principles* as are inconsistent with the *safety* of *all Governments*. I take this opportunity therefore of appealing to all who read this, to judge what the meaning of this can be. If He hath a secret reserve within his own Mind, that the *Present Government* is *No Government*, properly so call'd; because it is not settled upon *his* only lawful Foundation, and because his *Principles* can allow to No *Woman* any *Right* to *Civil Rule*: Then it is manifest, He deceives the World with *Words*; and may in his Conscience believe that the *safety* of this *Government*, improperly so called, depends entirely upon the *Truth* of my *Principles*, (as I dare say He doth) even whilst He declares them inconsistent with the *Safety* of those *Governments*, which alone, according to Him, deserve that name: But if in the words, *All Governments*, He permits us to include this *present Establishment*, which, He knows, He cannot so much as submit to, because it is founded upon that *Resistance* which I defend; then let any one judge, whether, if He *truly* thought my *Principles* destructive of it, He would not rather permit me quietly to work for the good of his *Main Cause*, than persecute me, for doing real Service to his *Master*, after the most virulent, and opprobrious manner: Let any one judge, whether, if He truly believed that my *Principles* were prejudicial to the *safety* of her *Majesty*'s *Government*, and the *Protestant Succession*, He himself would chuse the direct *contrary Principles*, to inculcate upon the Nation, in order to serve the *Interest* of the *Pretender* who is set up against Her *Majesty*, and of the *Former Establishment*, which He openly defends: That is, in one word, whether He can think *my Principles* destructive of *Government*, whilst He himself chuseth the very contrary

trary as the most likely to bring about its destruction, and often expresseth an hope of compassing his *End* in time; or, whether his chusing the *contrary Principles*, in order to ruine the *present*, and restore the *Former Establishment*, be not a Demonstration that He himself thinks that the *Present Government*, and the *Protestant Establishment* cannot be safe, and secure, *without* my Principles.

*FINIS.*

---

*ERRATA.*

PAge 3. l. 4. *read* obligation. p. 8. l. 14. after *Self-Defense* put; *ib.* l. 17. after *Governours* put. p. 9. l. 24. *dele*, p. 17. l. 16. read *Lordship's*. p. 21. l. 28. *dele*, p. 24. l. 8. *after* which *dele*, p. 31. l. *ult. read* which. p. 37. l. 34. *for* it *read* you. p. 50. l. 20. for: put. p. 52. l. 32. read *Society*. p. 55. l. 30. *read* whoever. p. 57. l. 28. *read* insinuated. p. 59. l. 4. *read* cannot.